

THE
LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JULY, 1870.

- ART. I.—1. *Faraday as a Discoverer*. By JOHN TYNDALL. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1868.
2. *The Life and Letters of Faraday*. By DR. BENCE JONES, Secretary to the Royal Institution. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1870.
3. *Experimental Researches in Chemistry and Physics*. By MICHAEL FARADAY, D.C.L., F.R.S., &c. London: Taylor & Francis. 1859.
4. *Experimental Researches in Electricity*. By MICHAEL FARADAY, D.C.L., F.R.S., &c. London: T. & J. E. Taylor. 1839—44.

THE danger which many of the world's greatest men have encountered of not attaining to the positions for which their natural endowments fitted them, suggests the possibility that others of equal power may have failed to escape obscurity and callings for which nature had not designed them. In Newton selling corn and cattle in Grantham Market, Tycho Brahe and Sir Robert Strange copying parchments, Copernicus handling the pestle and mortar, and Captain Cook standing behind a village counter, we see men whose genius soon burst the bonds of circumstances and created the conditions needful for its development. Is it the unfailing attribute of genius to do this? Are the lofty powers of a Humboldt or a Cuvier absolutely irrepressible, or have men of equal calibre sunk into unknown graves? This is a problem to which no satisfactory solution can be given. But when we think of the slight incidents which often change a man's future career, we cannot but fear that, from the lack of aid in early life, some, who might have stood in the foremost ranks, had they in their youth been placed upon the right line, have failed to emerge from the crowd.

These thoughts are suggested by the history of Michael Faraday, the outlines of which have long been familiar to scientific circles, but have only reached the outer world through the recent and excellent memorials of Dr. Tyndall and Dr. Bence Jones.

Faraday was descended from a family of humble yeomen, who were members of a small Sandemanian Society at Clapham, in Yorkshire. His father was a blacksmith, who removed towards the close of the last century to Newington, in Surrey, where the future philosopher was born in September, 1791. The fortunes of the family sank very low. The father died in middle life, but the mother lived long enough to witness some of the honours which clustered around her distinguished son. Under such circumstances Faraday's education was necessarily of the humblest description, and in 1804 he engaged himself as errand-boy to a bookseller, who in 1805 made him an apprentice, when, as his indentures still testify, "in consideration of his faithful service, no premium is given." In this part of his career there is much reminding us of Benjamin Franklin. Scientific books, amongst others, passed through his hands whilst pursuing his daily labour, and were freely read by the young student, whose tastes were already leading him to those branches of natural philosophy which afterwards engaged his matured powers. Some lectures delivered by a Mr. Tatum, and, still later four lectures which he says he "had the good fortune" to hear from Sir Humphry Davy, tended further to confirm his taste for the same subjects. Some of his letters to a young Quaker friend, written at this time, have fortunately been preserved, and reveal in the youth of twenty a power, both of thought and expression only to be explained by the recognition of his high natural endowments. He had some time previously constructed electrical apparatus, and we now find him contriving a galvanic pile with alternate plates of zinc foil and halfpence. This was soon displaced by a more powerful one, with which he experimented upon the decomposition of mineral solutions, and reasoned on deep problems of chemical affinity with wonderful acuteness and accurate observation.

In 1812 his seven years' apprenticeship terminated, and he took a situation as a journeyman bookbinder; but his heart was with his philosophy and not with his calling. One extract from a letter written at this time is significant of something yet higher than philosophy. He says—

"I am well aware of my own nature. It is evil, and I feel its influence strongly; I know too, that—but I find that I am passing

insensibly to a point of divinity, and as those matters are not to be treated lightly, I will refrain from pursuing it. All I mean to say on that point was that I keep regular hours, enter not intentionally into pleasures productive of evil, reverence those who require reverence from me, and act up to what the world calls good. I appear moral, and hope that I am so, though at the same time I consider morality only as a lamentably deficient state."—*Life*, vol. i. p. 48.

His yearning after higher pursuits than trade could furnish led him, in 1812, to apply to Sir Humphry Davy, then in the zenith of his fame, for help and guidance. The great chemist, in the first instance, wisely checked Faraday's desire to abandon his calling and devote himself to science as a profession, on the ground of its uncertain and limited emoluments; but luckily, before many weeks elapsed, he suddenly required a chemical assistant in the laboratory of the Royal Institution, and, remembering the young applicant, offered him the place. Faraday eagerly seized the opportunity, and, the appointment being sanctioned by the managers, the young philosopher, in March, 1813, commenced that connection with the Institution which only terminated with his life. Here he soon found himself in harness, aiding Sir H. Davy in investigating those remarkable explosive compounds of chlorine and nitrogen which are even now but imperfectly understood, and the power of which was demonstrated by four dangerous explosions within the first month of his new occupation. Within three months he recorded his views respecting lectures and lecturers in a series of letters of a most masterly character; one of these especially embodies such accurate directions that few even of the most accomplished teachers would fail to learn something from its perusal.

In October, 1818, Sir Humphry Davy determined to take a prolonged European tour, and invited his young assistant to accompany him as his amanuensis, which offer Faraday accepted, and the next year and a half was spent in France, Switzerland, and Italy. Whilst thus engaged he kept a detailed journal, which is full of shrewd observations on men and things apart from his special pursuits. In Paris, Ampère and some other chemists introduced the travellers to iodine, with which they had hitherto been unacquainted, but which had been recently discovered by Courtois, a French manufacturer of saltpetre. While assisting Davy in his experiments upon the new substance, Faraday was brought into contact with Chevreul and Gay Lussac, and science was intermingled with sight-seeing; whilst his "shopping" experiences show us that the modern Parisian institution of *prêt à faire* had not

yet found its way into the French capital, for, in much disgust he comes to the conclusion that "*every tradesman here is a rogue.*"

After spending three months in Paris the voyagers went by way of Nemours and Moulins and Lyons to Montpellier, and afterwards through Nice and the Col de Tende to Turin and Genoa, where they experimented upon some living torpedoes, and saw waterspouts. At Florence they saw the first telescope and lens made by Galileo, with which he discovered the satellites of Jupiter; here they also conducted a series of experiments on the combustion of the diamond in various gases, which of course confirmed their convictions that the diamond consisted of pure carbon, a fact now familiar to us, but then *sub judice*. These experiments ended, they moved on to Rome and Naples, in which neighbourhood Faraday's attention seems to have been divided between Vesuvius and observations on the luminosity of fire-flies. Amongst other learned men with whom he came in contact here was Volta, whose labours he was destined to supplement in so signal a manner, though neither of them forecasted the full significance of the interview when they first met.* Working at the solar spectrum with Pictet, they obtained their first practical demonstration of Herschel's discovery that the chemical ray was external to the others, whilst Sir Humphry Davy, the original "Green Man," varied his philosophical pursuits with quail-shooting on the plains of Geneva and hauling trout out of the Rhone. Towards the end of April, 1815, they returned to England, when Faraday resumed his post at the Royal Institution, and commenced within its walls that career of learning, teaching and discovery that lasted until his death. From this time his life presents no incidents, apart from its science, beyond what are common to most men. The assistance he was officially required to render to Sir Humphry Davy and Mr. Brande in their researches in the laboratory and in the experimental illustrations required for their public lectures, became, to one of his quick intellect, a discipline of the utmost value, training him for independent action. Science was already to him the loftiest of temporal pursuits, and he regarded the opportunities he enjoyed of indulging his tastes as a privilege of the highest order. Hence he threw himself into its study with an energy only to be found in men who regard pecuniary interests as of secondary importance, and his enthusiasm soon bore fruit. He began his career as a lecturer in January, 1817, by delivering a course of six lectures at

* We are surprised that Dr. Bence Jones has no word of note or comment for so significant an interview.

the City Philosophical Society, in which he grappled boldly with many of the philosophical problems the solution of which occupied much of his subsequent life; whilst a paper on an analysis of native caustic lime, published in the *Quarterly Journal of Science*, was the first of that marvellous series of memoirs which flowed from his pen. Dr. Bence Jones very justly regards the period extending over the fifteen years after his return from his tour as that of his scientific education; but it was an education in which he taught almost as much as he learnt. During that period sixty important scientific papers were published by him—nine of them appearing in the *Philosophical Transactions*—and yet in the labours of this part of his life he was but laying the foundations of his grand career; though the germs of most of his subsequent discoveries are traceable in these his earlier writings. The only events of a personal character materially affecting his life were his marriage, in June, 1821, to Miss Sarah Barnard, the sister of the well-known art teacher of that name, and his recognition as something higher than the assistant of other teachers, when the managers of the Royal Institution made him the Director of their Laboratory, in February, 1825; a step which proved of incalculable importance to the Institution, since it at once led to the establishment, by Faraday, of those Friday evening meetings which still constitute to the world outside the great charm of Albemarle Street. In Davy he found a teacher possessing very opposite qualities of good and evil. Faraday recognised with enthusiasm what was good and deserving of imitation in the great chemist, while at the same time he saw clearly the patent faults which marred the perfectness of Davy's character. The fact is that the latter had aristocratic as well as scientific notions. When at Geneva he took offence because the elder De la Rive invited him and his young assistant (whose merits the great Swiss had already discovered) to dine at the same table. At a later period unmistakeable signs of jealousy showed themselves, consequent upon that success of his young protégé which ought to have been his greatest pride, and this weakness culminated in 1824, when Faraday was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society—which election Davy strenuously opposed, if he did not even deposit the only black ball found in the ballot-box on that occasion. Davy would have been far more proud of inheriting his baronetcy from a race of fox-hunters than he was of receiving it as the reward of scientific eminence. He had a vague notion that he had a claim to some such heritage, and the result too frequently showed itself in his intercourse with

his subordinates. But Faraday was too wise and too good to resent the failings of one to whom he owed so much. The evil has passed away, whilst Faraday's subsequent career is a proud evidence of the good done by the training he received under Sir Humphry Davy. The range of Faraday's studies was of a wide character, embracing a variety of topics apart from those whose investigation became the business of his life. But it was in the latter that he achieved his greatest triumphs—in chemistry and those branches of natural philosophy, such as electricity and magnetism, which were most intimately related to chemistry. He was a pure experimentalist, rich in contrivances for discovering and elucidating facts, of which his logical mind caught, as by intuition, the mutual relations and the laws of their association. Being ignorant of mathematics, he was unable to enter upon those higher analyses which have elevated Herschel, Arago, and Ampère to their lofty positions; but he achieved equally grand results with humbler instruments. What he would have accomplished had the higher mathematical appliances been available to him it is impossible to say. We are not sure that a man with so suggestive a mind might not have been led away by the machinery of symbols from that experimental line of research for which Faraday's genius so eminently qualified him.

The time at which he commenced his career was a remarkable one. Dalton, by his discovery of the laws of atomic proportion, had laid the foundations of chemical science, and a noble superstructure had been raised by Wollaston and Davy, Vauquelin and Berzelius; Davy especially had separated the metallic bases of potass, soda, strontia, lime, barytes, and lithia, through the power of voltaic electricity, and discovered the elementary character of the so-called oxymuriatic acid of Berthollet, giving it the name of chlorine. Vauquelin had discovered chromium, and Wollaston palladium and rhodium, besides teaching chemists how to make the unmanageable metal platinum available as an instrument of chemical research. Sertüerner had discovered morphia, leading the way to the study of the vegetable alkalies now so numerous; Dr. Courtois had found iodine. But little was then known of what we are now so familiar with under the name of organic chemistry, and still less of the wonderful relations existing between chemical action and the imponderable agencies of heat and light, electricity and magnetism. Volta had immortalised his name by the invention of his voltaic pile, though he was ignorant of the true nature of its action. He believed that the galvanic currents which it generated

were independent of the chemical reactions by which their generation was accompanied, but of which he was ignorant. But magnetism on a yet grander scale than that on which it was studied by Volta began to attract attention. The Academy of Sciences in Paris had detected the importance of dynamic electricity; and Rossel, Humboldt, Hansteen, and Sabine had already worked out a series of important results, indicative of the probable relations of terrestrial magnetism to the surface of the earth, when Faraday began his career. A scientific inquiry had also been directed into some special channels, which became of the utmost importance to Faraday. Wollaston's clear intellect had seen the probable relations of electricity to chemical action, but he did not prove them. Oersted, of Copenhagen, passing electric currents through a wire in the immediate neighbourhood of and parallel to the axis of a magnetic needle, found that the latter became the subject of a series of definite movements, reversible with every reversion of the electric current, proving the close connection subsisting between electricity and magnetism. This connection of the two forces was still more brilliantly elucidated by Ampère, who coiled his conducting wire round a bar of unmagnetised soft iron and, by the power of the current passing through the coil, converted the iron into a magnet so long as the current continued to flow. Through his position at the Royal Institution at the time when these discoveries were being made, Faraday became familiar with them; and as they proved to be the portals of vast and unexplored regions, he entered upon his career of investigation at a favourable moment. Problems of the deepest interest presented themselves on every side, and it was characteristic of the man that he at once began to grapple with some of the most difficult of them. Whilst in the elementary stage of his education his labours demonstrate his possession of the power to soar. Only an intellect of the highest order could have taken the interest in, or seen the significance of, such abstruse questions. He not only did so, but in their eventual elucidation he achieved his greatest triumphs. In 1818 we find him studying the problem of electric induction, and the nature of the sounds produced by flame in tubes; in 1819 he is observing the conversion of gases into fluids and solids. In 1821 a suggestion emanating from Dr. Wollaston turns his attention to electro-dynamics and the rotation of wires and magnets, and in 1823 he records in a book which he termed *Chemical Notes, Hints, Suggestions, and Objects of Pursuit*, "the conversion of magnetism into electricity" as a result to be attained; whilst in Septem-

ber of the same year he endeavours to obtain some experimental proof of the relation of electricity and magnetism to light, which for forty years of his life continued to be one of his favourite subjects of study.

As we have already seen, his first published paper, in 1816, was a chemical one recording an analysis of caustic lime. In 1817 six papers appeared, two of which were chemical, whilst four dealt with the philosophy of Davy's safety lamp, with the compression of gases, and with the escape of gases through tubes. In 1818 his memoirs were chiefly chemical, as was also the case in 1819 and 1820. In 1821 he read his first memoir to the Royal Society—still on chemical subjects; but in September of the same year he made his first discovery in the department of electro-dynamics, in effecting the rotation of a wire round a magnet, and of a magnet round a wire—a development of Wollaston's suggestive attempts in the same direction. He was now fairly embarked on his voyage of electro-magnetic research, a voyage which only ended with that of his life. The rotatory motion referred to is now capable of being exemplified by several remarkable pieces of mechanism, and, though it did not lead to such important results as other discoveries, the genius with which the elements of the problem were apprehended and the skill with which the investigation was brought to a successful issue afforded one of the most striking evidences of the lofty power with which nature had endowed the young philosopher. This triumph in the domain of philosophy was achieved when he was, as he states in a letter to Mr. Stodart, "but a young man, and without a name." Instead of these discoveries being received by the scientific world as evidence that a star of the first magnitude was appearing above the horizon, an attempt was made to show that it merely shone by a reflected light which ought to be extinguished. The first suggestion as to the possibility of effecting the rotation of a magnetic wire had emanated from Dr. Wollaston, but the experiments with which he endeavoured to accomplish the object failed to do so. Faraday, on the other hand, whilst he owed nothing more to Wollaston than the suggestion of the possibility of such a rotation, by his ingenious arrangements succeeded in that experimental demonstration which Wollaston had failed to obtain. Some of Wollaston's friends availed themselves of the affair for the purpose of exciting a prejudice against Faraday—who was then a candidate for admission to the Royal Society—and but for his determined firmness, springing out of conscious rectitude, they would have succeeded.

Davy had, as we have said, on more than one previous occasion shown jealousy of the young aspirant for scientific fame. He was not prepared to see his servant become his equal; and, instead of shielding him from such attacks, he rather led the assailing forces, and threw obstacles in the way of his admission into the learned circle at Somerset House. Even after all calumnious rumours had been silenced, and Faraday's election in 1823 had taken place by the almost unanimous voice of the Fellows, Davy never recovered his former relations with his young assistant. But the discoverer of the safety lamp was no longer his former self. His aristocratic pretensions had raised a powerful opposition, even within the walls of the Royal Society, which excited his susceptibilities, and rendered him jealous and suspicious—a mental condition which reacted upon young Faraday, and might easily have crushed a less determined man.

Another of his important discoveries was made shortly after that of magnetic rotation, viz. the conversion of chlorine gas into a fluid state. The condensation of gases was not accomplished now for the first time. Monge and Clouet had long previously effected the same thing with sulphurous acid gas as Northmore had done with chlorine. But Faraday was not aware of these facts at the time of making his own experiments. Chlorine having become a favourite object of his studies, he experimented upon the hydrate of chlorine, a solid substance long thought to be solid chlorine, but which Davy had proved to be composed of chlorine and water. Whilst engaged in this investigation Sir Humphry Davy suggested to Faraday that he should heat crystals of this substance hermetically enclosed within a glass tube. He did so, and found that after their fusion he had two distinct fluids left in the tube, one of which he proved to be pure condensed chlorine. He subsequently obtained a similar condensation of the gas under a pressure of five atmospheres, compressing it by means of a syringe. Other gases were subjected to experiment with similar results; and though for a time these experiments were laid aside, he resumed them in 1844, adding the agency of cold to mechanical pressure, with admirable results. Some gases he converted into fluids and others into solids, but oxygen, hydrogen, and pure nitrogen resisted all his efforts, though he succeeded in solidifying the first and last of these when combined in the state of nitrogen monoxide—better known by its popular title of "Laughing Gas." The writer well remembers wit-

nessing his enthusiasm when expounding some of these later results at one of the Friday evening meetings of the Royal Institution. He exhibited his condensed gases enclosed within small glass tubes, and warned his hearers that even the heat of the finger and thumb with which he held the tube would, if unduly prolonged, suffice to occasion a fearful explosion. Notwithstanding this statement, so alarming to some of his nearer auditors, he continued his enthusiastic description of the processes by which he had obtained his grand results, until it became questionable whether he was not forgetting his own warnings; the hands of more than one of his hearers were raised to their eyes with the view of protecting them against a probable explosion, for no less than thirteen pieces of glass had previously been driven into the eye of the lecturer himself, by such an explosion, when experimenting upon these condensed gases in his own laboratory, a fact which some of his audience did not fail to remember. However, the master magician retained his control over the spirits which his genius had invoked.

In 1824 pure chemistry again occupied much of his attention, and in this branch of inquiry he made a discovery the practical importance of which is not easily exaggerated. A commercial company was manufacturing a portable gas from oil, and, through the pressure of thirty atmospheres to which the gas was subjected in this process, a small quantity of fluid residuum of an unknown nature was obtained. Faraday undertook the investigation of this residuum, and extracted from it the remarkable and hitherto unknown combination of carbon and hydrogen, termed benzol or benzine. The history of this compound administers a severe reproof to those narrow and ignorant mortals who are ever ready to decry as useless abstract scientific studies of which no immediate practical application can be demonstrated. In the hands of modern chemists and manufacturers Faraday's benzole has become the source of all the beautiful aniline dyes—mauves and magentas, blues and greens, violets, yellows, and browns—with which we are all familiar. From silks and cottons down to feathers and soap the world derives hourly testimony of the importance of the discovery made by the young chemist in Albemarle-street.

The discoveries to which we have already referred would have been sufficient to place their investigator in a high position among the first scientific men of the age, but they were made during what may be regarded as his student life. He was twenty-one years of age when he attached himself to the

Royal Institution; prior to that period, however intellectual his tastes, the necessities of his position debarred him from systematic study. Even after what proved to him so fortunate a change, his position of subordination to Sir Humphry Davy and the multifarious duties which he had to perform limited his opportunities for regular and independent research; besides which pure chemistry as yet engaged a large portion of his attention—a circumstance not to be regretted, since it afforded an admirable basis for those higher investigations in natural philosophy in which he was destined to achieve such marvellous triumphs. But the time was come at which he began to soar into loftier regions. He was now (1831) thirty-nine years old. His powers were becoming rapidly matured. The Governors of the Royal Institution had given him the independent position of Director of their Laboratory, so that he now ruled where he had hitherto served. Learned societies at home and abroad, including the Academy of Sciences in Paris, had begun to honour him by electing him amongst their honorary members. Such distinguished men as Ampère, De la Rive, and Hachette delighted to number him amongst their correspondents. He had begun to deliver those courses of lectures which were so long destined to delight and instruct both young and old; whilst he had by his occasional lectures done much to make the Friday evening meetings of the Royal Institution what they have ever since continued to be, among the most delightful of the many scientific assemblies with which the metropolis abounds. Such a position must have stimulated a feebler and less sensitive man than Faraday. To him it was the beginning of a new life.

It is almost impossible to make a reader unversed in the details of electric and magnetic science understand, in all their fulness, the investigations upon which Faraday now entered. It will be remembered that three distinct kinds of force had long been recognised—the ordinary or Franklinic electricity, galvanic or voltaic electricity, and magnetism. But, as we have already seen, very little was known of the actual nature of these forces, or of the relations which they bore to each other; the first had attracted attention through a longer period of time than the others, and, consequently, philosophers were acquainted with a larger number of its detailed phenomena than of either the second or the third. But, in addition to the uncertainty respecting the nature of these mysterious forces, which uncertainty unfortunately yet exists, many grave errors had been accepted as truths, which, con-

sequently, had to be removed out of the way. The inability to explain the phenomena of electricity, without admitting the existence of two separate fluids—one of which was termed positive and the other negative—led to the hypothetical recognition of such an existence, and out of this recognition sprang ideas of attraction and repulsion which ultimately proved to be most doubtful, if not altogether erroneous. At the same time the hypothesis is so convenient, and the technical phraseology resulting from it so commonly employed, that we are compelled to accept it until a more correct one is devised. The discovery that the friction of a stick of sealing-wax on a piece of woollen cloth caused the former to develop one kind of electricity, whilst, when a piece of glass was similarly heated, it produced the opposite kind, lay at the foundation of the whole question. The invention of the various forms of electric machine put into the hands of explorers powerful and convenient modes of obtaining these electricities; and then came the discovery, that by means of them corresponding electricities could be *induced* in other bodies brought into contact with them, or into their immediate neighbourhood. A recognition of this electric *induction* is necessary to our comprehension of Faraday's future labours. All bodies are more or less furnished with a neutral electricity, that is, with a combination of the positive and negative electricities, which, in their combined state, produce no conspicuous effects. But these two electricities are capable of being torn asunder, as is done by the electric machine. The negative accumulates in the leather rubber, which presses upon the revolving glass plate or cylinder, while the positive is carried round by the glass under cover of a thin film of oil-silk with which the cylinder is partially surrounded. But the two differing electricities thus severed are impatient under their severance, and make violent efforts to become re-combined with their opposites, whilst each is yet more impatient of any attempt to bring it into further relationship with its own kind. In technical phraseology *opposite electricities attract one another, whilst similar ones repel each other*. A metallic conductor, having neutral electricity naturally clinging to it, is brought near to the electric machine, which, as we have seen, is liberating positive electricity. The latter, yearning for its negative opposite, decomposes the *neutral* electricity of the conductor, attracts the negative element to itself, and, through their mutual repulsion, drives off the positive to the remote end of the conductor. If the latter happens to be connected with a Leyden jar or battery, this, too, becomes

charged with positive, and robbed of its negative, electricity, and continues in a state of tension until the balance is restored, either through the slow action of the surrounding air, or through some neutral body coming sufficiently near to be decomposed in its turn, when the spark and the attendant shock announce that the positive and negative elements are again reunited and reduced to their neutral state.

When a measured quantity of either of these electricities is stored up in any form of receiver, it can only furnish a supply to another receiver by sharing what it possesses, the gain of the one being obtained through the loss of the other. Here we have one of the most striking features of difference between electricity and magnetism. A magnet can supply any number of other bodies capable of becoming magnetised with magnetic power, and yet itself suffer no loss. So marked a difference between the behaviour of the electric and magnetic forces might well justify the notion that they were quite distinct. But, as we have seen, Ampère proved that magnetism could be produced in a bar of soft iron by causing a spiral current of electricity to revolve round it, and thus demonstrated the possibility of electricity being converted into magnetism, the latter being *induced* in the soft iron through the action of the former.

Faraday, whose mind had been long impressed with the probable unity and correlation of the great physical forces operating in the universe, sought to reverse this operation, and to obtain electricity from magnetism; but before we can hope to make our non-scientific readers understand the processes by which Faraday achieved his object, we must call their attention to a preliminary discovery made by him, viz. that of electro-voltaic induction. He coiled a long wire round a wooden cylinder and connected it with a powerful voltaic battery. He then coiled a second wire, isolated from the first, but parallel with it, round the same cylinder, and connected it with a galvanometer. He then caused the electric current to flow through the first of these wires, expecting to find that, by an inductive process somewhat similar to that already referred to in connection with Franklinic electricity, some effect would be produced by the first wire, through which the current was flowing, upon the second, with which the former had no connection beyond that of parallel proximity. Faraday had experimented upon this subject several years previously, but without obtaining any result, probably because he expected that the effects to be produced would be as continuous as the exciting electric current. On the latter and more

successful occasion he at first failed as before ; but, though a continuous current produced no effect upon the galvanometer, his quick eye soon detected a momentary movement when the electric current began to flow, and another when it ceased to do so. He further found that the first of these *induced* currents moved along its wire in the opposite direction to that of the current *inducing* it, whilst the second, occurring when the inducing current was interrupted, flowed in the reverse direction, or in the same way as the inducing one. He had thus made his grand discovery of electro-magnetic induction—a discovery the importance of which will be felt to the end of time, because of the innumerable practical and economic applications of which it is capable, if for no higher reason. We remember exhibiting, long ago, one of the earliest of the innumerable forms of induction-coils—as the cylinders, with their surrounding wires, are termed—to a number of commercial and *practical* men who were disposed to sneer at the investigations of abstract science. “ Very fine,” said one of them, with a contemptuous smile ; “ but what is the use of it all ? ” The exhibitor could only insist on the duty of pursuing scientific researches for their own sake, leaving the practical applications of all discoveries to a future which might not be remote. We have lived to remind more than one of the company of the scene, as well as of the endless applications of an apparatus which, at the time in question, was but in its germinal state. Since then Ruhmkorff and Ladd have wonderfully added to the power of the simple coil, whilst, in the hands of Saxon and Clarke, Siemens and Halske, and especially of Mr. Wilde, of Manchester, magnets have been applied to the coil as generators of the electric force, with a power surpassing all that imagination could well conceive of. With this latter instrument Mr. Wilde melted seven feet of No. 16 iron wire ; made twenty-one feet of the same wire red-hot, and produced an illumination so brilliant that gas flames, placed in front of the apparatus, cast a shadow upon the opposite houses ! To these and numerous allied modifications of Faraday’s great discovery we owe our entire system of telegraphy, time signals, electric illumination, electric clocks, and the use of magnetic electricity for therapeutic purposes, as well as hundreds of other minor applications which we cannot stay to enumerate, but which are daily adding to the sources of human comfort by enlarging man’s power of controlling the forces of nature.

We have stated that one of the great results at which Faraday aimed in these researches was the demonstration of

the identity of magnetism and electricity by the production of electric phenomena, through the generating power of magnets unaided by voltaic decompositions. In speaking, as we have just done, of various magneto-electric machines, we have anticipated one special theme. Faraday at length succeeded in producing the desired demonstration. We quote Professor Tyndall's admirable description of this discovery, from which it will be seen that the phenomena of electro-magnetic induction were repeated in the case of pure magnetic induction, affording a new proof of the identity of the two forces of electricity and magnetism:—

“Round a welded iron ring he placed two distinct coils of covered wire, causing the coils to occupy opposite halves of the ring. Connecting the ends of one of the coils with a galvanometer, he found that the moment the ring was magnetised, by sending a current through *the other coil*, the galvanometer needle whirled round four or five times in succession. The action, as before, was that of a pulse, which vanished immediately. On interrupting the circuit, a whirl of the needle in the opposite direction occurred. It was only during the time of magnetisation or demagnetisation that these effects were produced. The induced currents declared a *change* of condition only, and they vanished the moment the act of magnetisation was complete.

“The effects obtained with the welded ring were also obtained with straight bars of iron. Whether the bars were magnetised by the electric current, or were excited by the contact of permanent steel magnets, induced currents were always generated during the rise and during the subsidence of the magnetism. The use of iron was then abandoned, and the same effects were obtained by merely thrusting a permanent steel magnet into a coil of wire. A rush of electricity through the coil accompanied the insertion of the magnet; an equal rush in the opposite direction accompanied its withdrawal. The precision with which Faraday describes these results, and the completeness with which he defines the boundaries of his facts, are wonderful. The magnet, for example, must not be passed quite through the coil, but only half through, for if it passed wholly through the needle it stopped as by a blow, and then he shows how this blow results from a reversal of the electric wave in the helix. He next operated with the powerful permanent magnet of the Royal Society, and obtained with it, in an exalted degree, all the foregoing phenomena.”—*Faraday as a Discoverer*, p. 24.

The identity of the two great forces required yet one more proof, namely, the production of the spark which appears whenever a current of electricity is interrupted, and has to pass through some non-conducting or imperfectly conducting body in order to continue its course. But Faraday at length succeeded

in arranging an *experimentum crucis* which afforded him what he sought. Nobili and Antinori, Forbes and Ritchie, successively obtained further illustrations of the correctness of Faraday's discovery, and the production of the magneto-electric spark is now one of the common experiments of the lecture-room.

Results such as we have endeavoured to explain require to be thoughtfully contemplated, if we would obtain a correct estimate of their importance and grandeur. With electricity the thunderstorm had made men practically familiar from the beginning of time, though they knew nothing of its nature. Six hundred years before our era Thales detected the peculiar phenomena resulting from the friction of amber. In the seventeenth century, Gilbert demonstrated the fact that numerous other substances produced the same effects. Otto de Guericke of Magdeburg, the inventor of the air-pump, gave us also in the seventeenth century the first electrical machine, in which a ball of sulphur, turned by a handle, was the cylinder, whilst the hand of the operator supplied the place of a rubber. Then came the glass cylinder of Hawksbee, in 1708; to which Winkler supplied the rubber in 1741, and Boze, of Wirtemberg, added the conductor in the same year. Thus, little by little, the more conspicuous features of electricity became familiar to the scientific world. Franklin next appears upon the scene, and by the aid of his immortal kite links all these phenomena with those of the thunder-cloud, and demonstrates their unity. At the time when the great American was closing his career Galvani was preparing to publish his discovery of electric force developed when plates of zinc and silver, connected by a wire, were brought into contact with the nerves and muscles of a frog. Still later, Volta based upon the discoveries of Galvani his celebrated voltaic pile—Galvani and Volta being equally ignorant of the true nature of the forces which they taught the world to evoke. But in addition to these discoveries, knowledge of another kind had descended to us from the remote ages of antiquity. Aristotle and Pliny were acquainted with the magnet; and at a later date the Chinese discovered, what the Greek and Roman philosophers were ignorant of, the magnetic needle and its application to the mariner's compass. In the Elizabethan age De Gilbert led the way in the study of its properties, and first suggested the idea of a great central loadstone in the interior of the globe, in explanation of the properties of the needle. Norman, still later, observed its dip, and Graham its diurnal variation, and so the ball of discovery, receiving fresh impulse from a

succession of distinguished explorers, continued to roll on until Oersted and Ampère achieved the triumphs to which we have already referred. The combined agencies of this brilliant galaxy of great men prepared the way, and Faraday, entering upon their labours, consummated the work. Magnetism, galvanism, voltaism, and electricity are now demonstrated to be but a varied series of phenomena resulting from one common force, which vibrates in each minute fibre of nerve and muscle within the animal frame, and yet rushes round our globe more swiftly than human thought can follow it; the nervous system of the universe, linking together the varied elements of heaven and earth, and forcing them into harmonious sympathy and co-operation. It is the men who thus cause the innumerable lines of human thought to converge upon a few clear, luminous points, that stand foremost in the intellectual annals of the world; and whatever may be the future history of science, so long as science has a history Faraday's discoveries in electro-magnetism will secure his name a place among those of the most illustrious.

But though we have been tempted for a moment to wander from the record of Faraday's labours, we have not exhausted that record. We now find him entering upon a new series of inquiries, the full significance of which has yet to be ascertained. His clear intellect never lost sight of the probable unity of all the great forces of nature, and the possibility of expressing that unity in a few simple but all-comprehensive formulæ. Imbued with this idea he sought to track the electric forces, with which he was so familiar, amidst the complex movements of atoms as these latter altered their condition during chemical changes. The idea of unity to which we have just referred has long been present in the minds of men. Its entertainment alone gives them no claim upon the world's homage. The honour belongs to those who demonstrate it, and who give us quantitative measurements of the relations of one force to another. Many men had surmised the unity of heat and force, but it remained for Joule to demonstrate that unity by showing how much *force* was necessary to raise the temperature of a pound of water by one degree of *heat*. Prior to the discoveries of Faraday, the voltaic force had been used for the purpose of producing chemical decompositions. Nicholson and Carlisle had discovered the fact that electricity exercised a power over chemical combinations, and Sir Humphry Davy had employed galvanism in his great discovery of the separation of their metallic bases from the alkaline earths. Both Volta and Davy believed that the

electric current was set up *through the mere contact* of the two different metals used both in the voltaic pile and the galvanic trough, though the latter philosopher surmised the possibility that *additions* might be made to the electric force through the chemical actions to which the metals were exposed. We need scarcely remind our readers that a simple galvanic apparatus consists of a plate of zinc and a plate of copper, soldered together and immersed in a diluted acid or in some saline solution. The acid, whether free or combined in a salt, soon attacks the zinc and combines with it. Thus, if hydrochloric acid be used, the chlorine unites with the zinc to form a chloride of that metal, and the hydrogen gas is set free. If the zinc alone was immersed in the acid the bubbles of hydrogen would rapidly cover its surface, and in some degree arrest further action by intervening between the metal and the acid. But if a copper plate be also immersed in the fluid, and the two metals be united by a connecting wire, all the bubbles rapidly leave the zinc and cover the copper, as if it, and not the zinc, were the seat of the chemical action in progress. Such, however, is not the case, and the transference of the hydrogen bubbles from the zinc to the copper is one of those mysterious phenomena of which the explanation can be but hypothetical, though the hypothesis generally accepted bears every appearance of truth. Faraday soon satisfied himself that the evolution of the electric force was absolutely dependent upon the chemical action, and not, as Volta had supposed, upon the mere contact of the metals; that, in fact, if no chemical action took place, probably no electricity would be evolved, however close the contact of the two plates might be. Satisfied on this point, he now moved onwards towards his grand discoveries in electrolysis—on the decomposition of metallic solutions through the power of the electric current. We scarcely need again remind our readers that the mere decomposition of chemical solutions by voltaic currents involved no novelty, since it had been accomplished by Davy and others during the time of Volta himself. But Faraday proceeded to investigate the conditions under which these decompositions took place, to adopt a standard of measurement, and to ascertain the exact quantitative relations subsisting between the amount of electric force called into action and the work which it performed. But as he proceeded with his work he found himself encumbered by old and untenable notions. Previous to his day, the end of the wire proceeding from the zinc plate to his battery had been spoken of as the *positive pole*, and that connected with the

copper the negative *pole*. But the term *pole* suggested to his mind a system of attractions and repulsions in which he did not believe. The wires were to him nothing more than the portals through which the electric currents reached the objects upon which he was experimenting. Hence, rejecting the word *pole*, as suggestive of error, he substituted the term *electrode*, a term now universally employed. Giving unity to his phraseology, he termed the solutions upon which he was operating, electrolytes, and to the collective process he gave the name electrolysis. Having thus rid himself of hypothetical associations tending in a wrong direction, he proceeded to do the same thing with collateral sources of experimental errors; the idea being impressed upon his mind that if the development of electricity were due, as he conceived, to chemical decomposition, there must be some definite relationship between the proportions of the two. But here a difficulty stood in his way. He required a measure of the amount of electricity evolved; and after a multitude of experiments he found that the quantity of water decomposed by the current was an exact measure of that amount. Here again his experiments were beset with difficulties; but no labour, however prolonged, deterred him from endeavouring to solve them. The size, shape, and composition of his electrodes, the strength of the acid solutions in his galvanic cells, or the amount of time over which the operation was extended, might affect the result. Each of these points was tested in every possible way, but an exhaustive series of experiments brought him to the same result, viz. that the amount of the electro-chemical decomposition depended upon the *amount* of the electric current transmitted through the electrolyte, and not upon its tension or any other condition independent of quantity. The same series of experiments also brought out the remarkable fact that, when an electric current is transmitted through a series of solutions of different chemical substances, the amount of each decomposed is represented by its atomic weight, leading to the discovery of a law of electro-chemical decomposition, which, as Dr. Tyndall correctly observes, "ranks, in point of importance, with that of definite combining proportions in chemistry."

Another remarkable discovery was made during the same investigation, viz. that the *quantity* of electricity developed by means of the ordinary electric machine is exceedingly small when compared with that obtained from the voltaic cell. Faraday pointed out how large a quantity of voltaic electricity was necessary to decompose a single grain of water,

and which he believed to be equal to a very powerful flash of lightning. He then reasons thus:—

“Considering this close and twofold relation, namely, that without decomposition transmission of electricity does not occur; and that for a given definite quantity of electricity passed, an equally definite and constant quantity of water, or other matter, is decomposed; considering also that the agent, which is electricity, is simply employed in overcoming electrical powers in the body subjected to its action; it seems a probable, and almost a natural consequence, that the quantity which passes is the *equivalent* of, and therefore equal to, that of the particle separated, *i.e.* that, if the electrical power which holds the elements of a grain of water in combination, or which makes a grain of oxygen and hydrogen in the right proportions unite into water when they are made to combine, could be thrown into the condition of a *current*, it would exactly equal the current required for the separation of that grain into its elements again.”—*Experimental Researches*, 7th series.

He then proceeds to show how enormous must be the amount of electric force existing in connection with the matter in the universe. He had previously shown that when he placed two wires, one of platinum and one of zinc, each $\frac{1}{4}$ of an inch in diameter, $\frac{1}{4}$ of an inch apart, and immersed them to the depth of $\frac{1}{4}$ of an inch in a solution composed of one drop of sulphuric acid and four ounces of water, the free ends of these metals being connected by a copper wire eighteen feet long and $\frac{1}{16}$ of an inch thick, he obtained as much electricity in about three seconds as he could store up in an electric battery consisting of fifteen Leyden jars, charged by thirty turns of a large electric machine. He now declares that 800,000 such charges would be necessary to supply electricity sufficient to decompose a single grain of water, and yet he supposes, as we have just seen, that an equal amount is normally associated with that small drop. When we remember how vast is the amount of aqueous vapour diffused through the atmosphere or stored up in the thunder-cloud, we need no longer marvel at the violence with which a storm bursts upon the earth. Rather may we wonder that such vast and terrible forces should be so balanced and restrained as to cause destruction and death to result from them so rarely.

One of the most characteristic features of Faraday's intellect lay in its readiness to seize upon suggestions such as would have escaped the notice of most other men. The series of experiments which we have last noticed satisfied

him of the inseparable connection subsisting between chemical action and the development of electricity; he then remembered that there are chemical actions, such as that of dilute sulphuric acid upon zinc, and of nitric acid upon oxide of lead, in which no electric current is produced. He endeavoured to explain the fact by supposing that, in the latter cases, no electricity is set free, because, in them, the opposing electric forces, disturbed during the decomposition, are exactly equal; therefore, they neutralise one another upon the spot, and occasion no appreciable manifestation of electric action. For every fact he sought an appropriate explanation. But whilst thus incessantly striving to penetrate the innermost arcana of nature—whilst seeking, mentally, to follow the movements of each atom of the elements under his consideration—no experimenter was ever more free from a tendency to hasty generalisation. With him hypothesis took its right position as the guide and handmaid to experiment. Whilst striving to grasp the deep things of the natural world, his real ignorance was prominently present to his mind. Even in the brilliant memoir in which these electro-chemical researches were laid before the Royal Society, he evinces this modest sense of the limits which bound his actual knowledge; for though his glance seemed to have penetrated the innermost substance of natural objects, and he had unusual temptations to theorise, he abstains, saying,—“I would rather defer revising the whole theory of electro-chemical decomposition until I can obtain clearer views of the way in which the power under consideration can appear at one time as associated with particles giving them their chemical attraction, and at another as free electricity.” Yet the intellect which suggested these cautious utterances was endowed with a prescient power which enabled him again and again to penetrate the future, and anticipate the practical discoveries of a later period. Two examples of this present themselves to our minds. Professor Wheatstone, when measuring the velocity of the electric current by means of his ingenious rotating mirror, discovered that it required time to pass through a long wire, reaching its middle part later than its two ends. Faraday recognised the fact, and said:—

“If the two ends of the wire in Professor Wheatstone’s experiments were immediately connected with two large insulated metallic surfaces exposed to the air, so that the primary act of induction, after making the contact for discharge, might be in part removed from the internal portion of the wire in the first instance, and disposed for the moment on its surface jointly with the air and sur-

rounding conductors, then I venture to anticipate that the middle spark* would be more retarded than before. And if those two plates were the inner and outer coatings of a large jar or Leyden battery, then the retardation of the spark would be much greater."—*Life*, p. 82.

When the submarine electric cables, which now cross the ocean, were first laid down, the exact difficulty suggested theoretically by Faraday became a serious practical one, especially in the instance of the first Anglo-American line. Here the accumulation of electricity in the cable threatened to interrupt its working power, its inductive capacity bearing an inverse ratio to the rapidity with which signals could be transmitted; and it was only by the invention of a means of discharging the induced electricity with which the cable became charged like a Leyden jar, that it could be made to work with promptness. The second example of Faraday's prescience exhibits his mind soaring with a yet loftier flight. The two views entertained respecting the source and nature of the action of the voltaic pile have been already referred to. They represent two schools of philosophy—one of which believes in Volta's contact theory, while the other accepts the chemical theory demonstrated by Faraday's experiments. But, notwithstanding their force, these experiments failed to convince several able men, especially on the Continent, that Volta's views were not tenable. Hence, in 1840, Faraday felt called upon to read two papers before the Royal Society, sustaining his views, and assailing the contact theory:—

"In conclusion," (says Dr. Tyndall, speaking of these papers), "Faraday brought to bear upon it an argument which, had its full weight and purport been understood at the time, would have instantly decided the controversy. 'The contact theory,' he urged, 'assumes that a force which is able to overcome powerful resistance, as, for instance, that of the conductors, good or bad, through which the current passes, and that again of the electrolytic action where bodies are decomposed by it, can arise out of nothing; that without any change in the acting matter, or the consumption of any generating force, a current shall be produced which shall go on for ever against a constant resistance, or only be stopped, as in the voltaic

* Wheatstone in his experiments had broken his long conducting wires at the middle and near each end, so that the electric current had to leap over the intervening non-conducting space, at each break occasioning a spark. These breaks in the wire were so arranged that the sparks could be reflected in a mirror set on the periphery of a rapidly revolving wheel which moved with a known velocity; though the sparks seemed to the eye to be simultaneous they were reflected in the mirror at different radii of the circle in which it moved, affording the means of measuring the retardation of the central spark.

trough, by the ruins which its exertion has heaped up in its own course. This would, indeed, be a *creation of power*, and is like no other force in nature. We have many processes by which the *form* of the power may be so changed, that an apparent conversion of one into the other takes place. So we can change chemical force into the electric current, or the current into chemical force. The beautiful experiments of Seebeck and Peltier show the convertibility of heat and electricity; others, by Oersted and myself, show the convertibility of electricity and magnetism. *But in no case, not even in those of the Gymnotus and Torpedo, is there a pure creation or a production of power without a corresponding exhaustion of something to supply it.* "—*Faraday as a Discoverer*, p. 63.

In this argument we have a distinct recognition of that doctrine of the conservation and correlation of the physical forces to which more recent investigations have given such wondrous significance, and of the truth of which, so far at least as heat and mechanical force are concerned, Dr. Joule has supplied an absolute demonstration.

Early in 1845 Faraday commenced another series of experiments, leading to most important results in two directions, namely, the division of all substances into magnetism and diamagnetism, and the magnetisation of a ray of polarised light. The latter was his primary object, and it was whilst seeking to accomplish this result that he discovered the important relation of all substances to magnetic action which led to the twofold division referred to. Early in his career the want of a better glass than was available for the construction of telescopic object-glasses led the Council of the Royal Society to appoint a committee; of which he was a member, to experiment upon the manufacture of glass, with a view to the improvement and greater uniformity of its density. The experiments failed, so far as related to their primary object; but in the course of them Faraday produced a peculiarly heavy glass, which was destined to play an important part in his new researches. Having fixed a large horse-shoe electro-magnet, with its poles uppermost, he took a small bar of this heavy glass, about half-an-inch thick and two inches long, and suspended it by its centre so that it could rotate freely between the poles of the magnet. So long as no current was passing through the coil the glass assumed no particular position; but the moment the current converted the bar into a magnet the suspended glass swung round and arranged itself at right angles to the direction of the magnetic current, or, in other words, at right angles to a line connecting the two poles of the magnet. This discovery

led him to experiment on all conceivable things. Solids, fluids, and gases were in turn investigated, and he found that they all placed themselves in one of two positions, viz. either in that of his heavy glass, crossing the line of magnetic force at right angles, or parallel with that line. He thus found that objects hitherto thought to be uninfluenced by magnetic forces were all more or less affected by them. Those which arranged themselves parallel to the current he termed magnetics, and those which assumed the opposite position he termed diamagnetics. He now made use of his heavy diamagnetic glass for further experiments. Still impressed by a notion of the unity of all physical forces, he sought to fathom the relations subsisting between those producing light and electricity.

But we must diverge, for a moment, from our subject to make a preliminary explanation. When a ray of light proceeds in a direct line from a luminous body to any other point, all the particles of ether along and around that line are supposed, by the undulatory theory of light, to be vibrating in directions perpendicular to its course. But when the ray has been reflected from a polished surface, or when it has been passed through certain crystals, it becomes *polarised*; that is, all the vibratory movements on which light depends are eliminated, excepting those taking place in certain lines. When the ray thus polarised is transmitted through a revolving eyepiece, which also only allows the vibrations to pass in certain lines, it is obvious that an eye placed behind the eyepiece will only see the light when the apparatus is put in such a position that its planes and those of the polarised light correspond. The mechanism of the two forces may be compared with what would occur if a person were attempting to thrust broad planks of wood through an aperture protected by two guards of iron bars one behind the other. If the bars in both the guards were arranged vertically, the planks would slip easily between them; but if one set was vertical, and the other horizontal, the planks would not pass unless one of the grates could be rotated so as to bring both the sets of bars into parallelism. The polarised light may be regarded as having passed through one of these sets of bars, whilst the "Nichols' Eyepiece" represents the other or rotating set. When the latter is in one position no light passes; but when it is made to revolve through a quarter of a circle, its transmitting plane corresponds with that of the polarised light which now becomes visible to the observer's eye. Faraday suspended a thick plate of his heavy glass between the two

poles of an electro-magnet in such a position that when the electric current was in action the ray of polarised light passed through the glass in a line parallel to that of the current. He then received it upon his Nichols' prism, so adjusted that the ray passed through it without interruption. It will be remembered that an electro-magnet is only magnetic so long as the electric current is flowing round it, and when the latter ceases all magnetism disappears from the soft iron. Faraday found that when he caused such a cessation his Nichols' prism instantly became dark, just as would have been the case had he made it revolve on its own axis through a quarter of a circle. The withdrawal of the magnetic force had caused one set of the iron bars to revolve, and place themselves at right angles to the other set; and as it was the heavy glass alone which the magnet affected, it was obviously the medium in which the change was wrought. When the magnetic force was passing through the glass the only vibrations of the luminiferous ether occurring in the polarised ray moved in one line; but the instant the magnetism disappeared the vibrations took place in a direction at right angles to that in which they had previously moved. Faraday thought that he had magnetised the ray of light. What he appears to have actually done was to produce a rotation of the plane of its polarisation.

In 1850, Faraday was pursuing a new series of experiments upon the magnetic state of gases, in the course of which he discovered the fact that oxygen was a highly magnetic gas: but, working out a train of inquiry on which his mind had long dwelt, he concluded that variations in its temperature, or, indeed, any variation which rendered it more rarefied, diminished, if it did not extinguish, its magnetic power. Having satisfied himself of the correctness of this conclusion, he was not slow in applying it to some of the grand cosmical phenomena of magnetism, the existence of which had been proved by observations made in every quarter of the globe. He demonstrated that the curving lines of magnetic force proceeding from the pole of a magnet were equally distributed, so that the sum of them in any one section of the magnetic field within which they operated was equal to their sum in any other equal section. But if he brought a sphere of iron or nickel into the field, these forces became contorted and concentrated within the sphere; so that a small magnetic needle, placed near the magnetic pole, instead of settling down in its normal position in reference to the pole, was materially disturbed by the presence of the metallic sphere. But he

discovered that, in proportion as he raised the temperature of the sphere, its disturbing power gradually became less, and at length almost entirely disappeared. Having thus afforded a new illustration of a previously known fact, viz. that heat diminished the power of a magnet, he applied his conclusions to the explanation of some of the phenomena of terrestrial magnetism. It is well known that when a compass needle is swung on either a vertical or a horizontal axis, it rests in different positions, according to the part of the globe in which the experiment is made. The horizontal needle of the compass, for instance, in our longitude does not point due north, but about $20\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$ west of it. This variation of the needle, termed its declination, is not constant, since, in 1818, it was as much as $24^{\circ} 30'$. Prior to 1660 the needle pointed eastward of the true meridian; it then began a westward movement, culminating in the above-mentioned year, and is now retrograding towards the east. But besides this movement of declination, when a needle is hung upon a horizontal axis, so that it swings freely in a vertical plane, it does not, in this latitude, retain a horizontal position, but its north pole sinks downwards at a considerable angle, the degree in which it moves away from the horizontal line being termed its *dip*, or inclination. In an irregular circle compassing the globe near to, but not exactly parallel with, the Equator, there is no dip, the needle retaining a perfect horizontality, whilst, on the other hand, as we proceed northward the dip increases, so that in a locality near Hudson's Bay, in latitude $70^{\circ} 5' 17''$ N., Sir James Ross, in 1831, found the needle to be almost absolutely vertical. Of course the *inclination*, or dip, as well as the *declination*, varies according to the geographical position of the observer. But it has also been found that both these movements of the needle are subject to secular as well as to geographical variations. We have pointed out one affecting its *declination*, and a similar one affects its *inclination*, which, in the year 1827, in the latitude of London, was $22^{\circ} 28' 8''$, whilst in 1865 it was only $18^{\circ} 50' 6''$. But besides these *secular* changes, there have been discovered more and more frequently recurring ones. A delicately-suspended magnet daily changes its position in reference to the magnetic meridian of each locality. The north pole moves westward from sunrise to an hour after noon, and then returns eastward until evening, when it remains stationary until sunrise on the following day. Besides this, which is termed the *solar-diurnal variation*, there is another, dependent upon the lunar day of four weeks; a further series of irregular disturbances, operating instan-

taneously over large portions of the globe, and termed magnetic storms; as well as other minor ones, on which we need not dwell. The solar-diurnal variation is not observed at the Equator. Faraday, ever aiming at the application of discoveries made in the laboratory to the elucidation of the grander phenomena of the cosmos, found a probable explanation of some of these diurnal and secular variations in his discovery of the magnetisation of oxygen. The sun rises in the eastern sky, and his warm beams diminish the magnetic power of the oxygen in the atmosphere, to which they supply heat. Hence the colder oxygen of the west, retaining its magnetic force, pulls the needle in that direction. But as the day rolls on the conditions are reversed. The eastern air again becomes cooled, and regains the magnetic power which it had lost, whilst in the west the opposite state prevails, consequently the needle is more powerfully attracted eastward than westward. The reason why the motion is reversed an hour after noon, instead of at the moment the sun passed the meridian, Faraday explained by showing that the heat which the atmosphere acquired from the sun is retained for some time after he has crossed the zenith. The absence of these variations at the Equator he also accounted for by the circumstance that, as the forces north and south of the Line are pulling the two poles of the needle equally in opposite directions, it necessarily remains unmoved. The grandeur of a philosophical explanation is proportionate to its simplicity, and in this aspect Faraday's reasoning leaves little to be desired. It rested on facts, and left few of the phenomena to which he applied it unexplained. At a later period he boldly endeavours to estimate the amount of magnetism in the earth, and considers that it equals that of 8,464,000,000,000,000,000,000 magnetic bars, each of which weighs one pound; but we need scarcely add that numbers like these convey to our finite minds no ideas whatever, save those of bewilderment.

In 1852-3, English society of every grade exhibited one of those strange manifestations of ignorance and folly which from time to time discredit us as a sober-minded race, and reflect upon the education which allows scholarly men thus to become the victims of the absurdest quackeries. Table-turning was everywhere in vogue, from the palace to the cellar, and every conceivable power of nature, real or unreal, from electricity to diabolical agency, was invoked to explain the movements of the whirling pieces of furniture. Faraday, for a time, looked on "more in pity than in anger," till at length he could no longer conceal his disgust at the outrage upon common sense

which he everywhere witnessed. But knowing that no mere reasoning, however logical, would convince a credulous people bent upon belief in the marvellous, he contrived a most ingenious apparatus, which visibly demonstrated to the dupes of ignorance that it was they who unconsciously *pushed* the table round, and not the table which pulled them. On June 30th, 1853, he sent a letter to the *Times*, and on July 2nd a still more elaborate one to the *Athenæum*, exposing the delusion; and, painful as the previous exhibitions had been, it was some consolation to thoughtful men to find that a master-mind still retained power over the tempest of folly. As if by magic, the appearance of these letters caused the credulous multitude to be for a season ashamed of the past, and to abandon the humiliating displays of their stupidity. But such ignorance is hydra-headed, and is not easily destroyed. After a time the delusion was revived in association with a wide-spread report that Faraday had discovered his error, and now recognised what he had previously scouted. The writer of this article told him of what was going on, and received the following reply:—

“Royal Institution, 27th December, 1853.

“DEAR SIR,—That I have withdrawn my letter on table-turning is a very fit assertion for the table-turners to make, and quite in keeping with the whole subject, inasmuch as it is utterly untrue. Do me the favour to contradict the assertion everywhere. At first I considered that the matter might be gently dealt with, as a mistake generally; but now I consider that it is simply contemptible.”

Unhappily for the world, the destruction of one form of credulity does not prevent the rise of others. Mankind seems unable to live without the excitement of some form of fashionable quackery. Some who were grieved to the very heart at the popular follies which they witnessed in the table-turning mania were themselves believing in the equally unreal follies of homœopathy, which again was followed by the more impious displays of the Spiritualists, the growth of whose absurdities Faraday lived long enough to witness. We need scarcely say that his contempt was once more excited, until, as he again and again exclaimed, “he was weary of the spirits,” and refused to devote any further time either to them or to their believers.

We must now leave Faraday the discoverer. There remains much that might be said of Faraday as a man, a friend, a teacher, a husband, and a Christian; but our space is more than gone. In each of these relations he approached as near

perfection as is perhaps given to mortals to do. His letters to his wife, when more than seventy years of age, were as fervent and loving as when she was the bride of his youth. As a teacher he had few equals, and no superiors. The marvellous power which he possessed of disentangling an obscure subject of its intricacies, and making it plain to ordinary intelligences, was well known to all who heard him. "The Friday evenings when he lectured at the Royal Institution were sure to bring crowds of eager hearers, delighted to sit at his feet. His clear style as a lecturer was no natural gift, but the result of careful culture in his early days. At the outset of his career, as we have already observed, he saw with intuitive vision what were the main requirements of a lecturer, and he sought such professional aid as could help him to attain his own high standard. He was wont, when a young man, to have his teacher amongst his auditors, in order that errors of style might be noted and corrected. The result of this painstaking habit was such a masterly power as is rarely witnessed behind the lecture-table. Another striking feature of his power is seen in the way in which he could withdraw his mind from his more special pursuits, and work up subjects of the most varied kind, in order to expound them at the weekly meetings of the Institution. A glance at the long list of topics on which he lectured from time to time will show the extent of this mental versatility. Yet he was never superficial, but always painstaking, fathoming the entire subject before he assumed the position of a teacher. The manner in which for nearly thirty years he filled his honourable and useful position as scientific adviser of the Brethren of the Trinity House, especially in connection with lighthouses, demonstrated his practical power of applying his scientific lore. On the laurels which he reaped in the shape of literary and scientific titles, transmitted from every portion of the civilised world, we will not dwell. In his case, emphatically, they were good because of what they found rather than of what they brought: he made the titles honourable.

We have hitherto referred to Faraday chiefly as a high-priest of Nature, revealing the hidden forces which are her handmaids, and making them manifest to the world. We have seen him grappling successfully with some of the most recondite problems which can engage the human intellect, and manifesting intellectual powers of a character so lofty and subtle that we may regard them as approaching those of a higher order of beings than human. When, with fixed gaze, he endeavoured to look into that dark region of the unknown

and unexplored which everywhere surrounds us—and how dark it is the most highly cultured can alone tell—though his sight fails to penetrate the mysterious gloom, he seems, like the blind, to feel what he cannot see; by intuitions almost inspired, his mind appears to track the subtle forces which play around our globe; and he calls them up from their hidden chambers to do his bidding, and be manifested to the world. It is this combination of the imaginative power with the severe habits of detailed observation that constitutes the highest philosopher. Faraday possessed it in a rare degree. But there is another aspect of the man which interests us yet more. What did his studies of the natural world teach him of the world's Author? Did he, than whom none knew more, and few so much, of the forces which move the universe, resolve the God of the universe into a mere aggregation of these forces? Did he look down upon the superstitious beliefs of Christians as unworthy of the philosopher and of science? Did he talk of worshipping God as much when on the mountain top, contemplating the glories of the physical world, as when bowing lowly and meek in temples made, it is true, with hands, but consecrated to His service, by loving and sanctified hearts? We hear nothing of this from his lips, neither do we witness it in his life. In his earliest manhood, if not even in his youth, we find a life devoted to his Maker's work. As years roll on, and the world's honours are cast before his undazzled eyes, his clear vision still looks through and beyond them all to the Father of Spirits, in whom he lives, and to the Son on whose redeeming love he rests every hope for time and eternity. There is no cant to be found in Faraday's words, but from the beginning to the end we note the clear expression of one who knows in Whom he has believed, and whose science is but the helper of his devotion. When a youth of twenty-one, he writes to his friend Abbott:—

“I thank that Cause, to whom thanks are due, that I am not in general a profuse master of those blessings which are bestowed on me as a human being—I mean health, sensation, time, and temporal resources. Understand me clearly here, for I wish much not to be mistaken. I am well aware of my own nature, that it is evil, and I feel its influence strongly. I appear moral, and hope that I am so; though, at the same time, I consider morality only as a lamentably deficient state. In every action of our lives I conceive that reference ought to be had to a superior Being, and in nothing ought we to oppose or act contrary to His precepts.”

In this letter Faraday strikes the key-note of his future life,

and to the last every vibratory string was harmonious with it. He defines a true friend as "one who will serve his companion next to his God." As time rolls on it is "the knowledge and love of the Lord Jesus Christ" that continues to be his avowed refuge and hope. When in middle life he is stricken by mental weakness, the result of an over-wrought brain, his cry still is, "Our hope is founded on the faith that is in Christ." In 1847, whilst lecturing at the Royal Institution, on physico-chemical philosophy, he does not shrink from declaring to his audience, "therefore our philosophy, whilst it shows us these things, should lead us to think of Him who hath wrought them; for it is said by an authority, far above even that which these works present, that the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead." In 1863, when the dark shadows of age are falling around him, when writing to his niece respecting some family anxieties, his language is, "All these events may well lessen our thoughts and hold of life. But what a blessing it is that there is nothing in them to diminish the hopes belonging to that far better life to which this is only the entrance. 'The sorrow is for the night only; joy cometh in the morning.'" When, a year later, failing powers have compelled him to resign nearly every scientific post, he clings to his Church Eldership, saying, "I dare not venture to put that from me which He has put upon me; and I call to mind that His throne is a throne of grace, where prayer may be made for help and strength in time of need." Addressing the highest in rank, he was not tempted to shrink from the expression of his faith and hope. When his Royal Highness the Count of Paris invited him to Twickenham, in 1863, after declining the invitation because of weakness, he adds, "I bow before Him who is Lord of all, and hope to be kept waiting patiently for His time and mode of releasing me, according to His Divine word, and the great and precious promises whereby His people are made partakers of the Divine nature." Thus the grand old man lived on, waiting patiently for the summons, which came on the 25th of August, 1867, when he passed from death unto life.

- ART. II.—1. *The War in Paraguay. With an Historical Sketch of the Country and its People, and Notes on the Military Engineering of the War.* By GEORGE THOMPSON, C.E., Lieutenant-Colonel of Engineers in the Paraguayan Army, Aide-de-Camp to President Lopez, Knight of the Order of Merit of Paraguay, &c. London: Longmans. 1869.
2. *Seven Eventful Years in Paraguay. A Narrative of Personal Experience amongst the Paraguayans.* By GEORGE FREDERICK MASTERMAN, late Assistant Surgeon, Professor of Materia Medica, Chief Military Apothecary, General Hospital, Asuncion, Paraguay, formerly of the Medical Staff of Her Majesty's 82nd Regiment. London: Sampson Low, Son and Marston. 1869.

THE long tragedy of Paraguay has reached at last its catastrophe, and we are placed in a position to make our readers acquainted with one of the most remarkable passages in the history of our own times. Habitual students of the morning journals are familiar with the words "The War in Paraguay," as the title of an occasional paragraph in South American news, bristling with uncouth names, and announcing decisive engagements which appeared to decide nothing. They have a general idea of a contest carried on in the interior of the continent by an alliance of two or three states against Paraguay, and of the gradual advance of the allies to a certain, though hardly-contested, victory. But it is scarcely a reflection on their powers of memory and of combination to suggest that comparatively few among them have formed any definite conception of the scene of conflict, the character of the combatants, or of the origin, object, and issues of the war. Yet the subject has many points of interest, and the books mentioned at the head of this paper would furnish topics of study to all who are interested in the history of nations.

Colonel Thompson entered the service of the Paraguayan Government as a Civil Engineer, but when war broke out, although he professes to have had no previous military education, he entered the army and rendered the most essential service. He commanded the fortress of Angostura, the capitulation of which, after the complete defeat of Lopez,

enabled him to return to Europe in safety and honour. Mr. Masterman also went to Paraguay in time of peace, as military apothecary, and subsequent events gave him sadly abundant professional occupation in the hospitals of Asuncion. Falling, with many others, under the suspicion of the President, he was imprisoned and tortured, and escaped only after a series of adventures most painful even in the recital. These gentlemen, occupying different points of view in every sense of the term, give the story of General Lopez and the war with substantial agreement of detail. Thompson does not extenuate, and Masterman, greatly to his credit, does not "set down aught in malice." Their testimony in reference to the internal condition of Paraguay is unexceptionable. Their views of the conduct of the allies, and especially of the Brazilian Government, may not improbably be called in question; but the facts of the history will form the best material for forming a judgment of the actors in it.

Paraguay lies almost in the centre of the great South American peninsula, and is practically accessible, even in time of peace, only through the river La Plata. Entering that splendid estuary, leaving the Banda Oriental and its capital, Monte Video, on the right, and Buenos Ayres, the capital of the Argentine Confederation, on the left, ascending the river Paraná through Argentine territory, we reach at last the city of Corrientes, eight hundred miles from the sea, where the river is still two miles in breadth. A short distance farther the river Paraguay, coming from the north, falls into the Paraná, which at that point bends towards the east. At the meeting of the two rivers the territory of Paraguay begins, bounded westward by the river Paraguay, southward and eastward by the upper waters of the Paraná. The northern and north-eastern boundary, separating it from the Empire of Brazil, has never been definitely settled. Paraguay claims also a portion of the Gran Chaco, a mere desert of swamp and jungle, which lies west of the river towards Bolivia. The country may be roughly estimated to be about four hundred and fifty miles in length, with a breadth of two hundred. Half cleared and thinly inhabited, this country, of perhaps half the size of France, is computed never to have had a population exceeding a million.

The lower portion, as will be understood from the above sketch of its position, lies between two great rivers in a semi-tropical climate. On the western side, near the river Paraguay, the country is level and marshy, constantly liable to be overflowed by the river, and presenting immense tracts called

esteros, which are simply fens covered with a rank vegetation growing through standing water. The south-eastern portion presents a lighter soil, at a greater elevation, and, as a consequence, a more salubrious climate. This part of Paraguay is called the *Misiones*, having been the scene of the labours of the Jesuits, and up to the commencement of the war it was the most populous and wealthy part of the country. Towards the north the country is more diversified, the landscape becomes bolder and more beautiful, a range of hills of considerable elevation stretches from the north-west towards the south-east, and the genuine forest scenery of tropical America develops all its magnificence. The warmth of the climate causes the spontaneous growth of vegetation in a luxuriance which it is difficult for us in colder regions even to imagine. The woods are not trackless only, but absolutely impassable, long tangled creepers and parasites forming a network from tree to tree. A more inviting field of study for the naturalist can hardly be desired, but it must not be entered without caution. It was here the apothecary, happy man, found the guaiacum and the copaiba growing *in situ*, and the apothecary's servant, more enviable still, picked up sweet oranges by the bushel on the road-side; but the waters that produce the *Victoria Regia* swarm with alligators; and the woods where palms and cedars blend their sombre hues with bright orchids, and bind their stately stems together with brown rope-like lianas, may hide the gleaming eyes of the jaguar, or the glittering scales of the boa constrictor.

Paraguay was occupied by the Spaniards about the middle of the sixteenth century. The Jesuits followed them almost immediately, building their first church in the year 1588. They sent to Europe a formal protest against the cruelty with which the Indians were treated by the local authorities, and, having obtained the sanction of the Court of Madrid, they proceeded to gather them into villages, to teach them various handicrafts, and to keep them in more than military discipline and obedience. They reduced their language, called Guarani, to a system of writing, and printed grammars, dictionaries, &c., as Protestant missionaries have done in other regions in more recent times; and they gave them such instruction in Christian truth as they supposed suitable to their condition. The first thing, however, the foundation and the corner stone of their instruction, was the inculcation of absolute and unquestioning obedience, of a faith in their masters like that which Protestants are taught to have in God alone. These strange communities continued in unbroken peace and pro-

sperity until the year 1767, when the Order of the Jesuits was expelled by an edict of the Spanish Government. Colonel Thompson appears to be surprised that they left the country peaceably, having secured so strong a hold of it that they might have resisted with a fair chance of success. He overlooks the fact that the Order of the Society of Jesus is a unity all over the world, and that a successful resistance in America would have been ruin in Europe, by justifying the suspicion that the society was aiming at an *imperium in imperio*, everywhere, both in Church and State. It was the policy of the Jesuits to bend to the storm. They abandoned Paraguay, but the subsequent history of the country suggests the thought that their one great lesson of unquestioning obedience to constituted authority has been bearing fruit, whether good or evil, from that day to this.

The first rupture between Paraguay and the inhabitants of the other Spanish settlements in South America took place as far back as 1811. The colonies on both sides the river La Plata had thrown off the yoke of the mother country, and had established a republican form of government. The new Republic of Buenos Ayres, in its zeal for the entire overthrow of Spanish supremacy in South America, sent an army under a General Belgrano to assist the Paraguayans in asserting their independence. The Paraguayans, however, refused to be liberated against their will; they stood by their rulers, and defeated Belgrano in two successive engagements. After his precipitate retreat, finding prolonged connection with Spain to be impossible, and influenced by the spirit of independence which was felt throughout the entire continent, they got up a bloodless little revolution of their own, and appointed two councillors to assist the Spanish Governor, Velasco, in forming a new Government. Two years afterwards two Consuls were appointed, Yegros and Francia. The former was incompetent and illiterate; the latter had but little difficulty in disposing of him, and was appointed by Congress sole Consul, and finally Dictator. He held the reins of government in a firm hand for six-and-twenty years, resigning them only at his death, on Christmas Day, 1840.

The Dictator Francia is the subject of an eloquent and interesting essay contributed by Thomas Carlyle to the *Foreign Quarterly*, and which is reprinted in his published works. The view of Francia's character and position which he takes may easily be imagined. Francia was the ablest man in the country, and the fittest to rule it. He did rule it laboriously and efficiently, securing for it both

internal and external tranquillity; and he deserves honour for his services, and pity rather than blame for the harsh methods he was sometimes compelled to adopt. The estimate formed of him by Colonel Thompson and by Mr. Masterman is less flattering. A few sentences from the latter may be interesting :—

“ At first he ruled with justice and moderation; he did much to improve the condition of the people, established schools, and reduced by a very summary process the streets of the capital to regularity. In the meantime the neighbouring Republics had commenced quarrelling; there was nothing but confusion and bloodshed, plots, and revolutions; and in order to prevent such a state of things occurring in the hitherto peaceful regions he governed, Francia determined to completely isolate Paraguay from the rest of the world. He would allow very few to enter and none to leave it.

“ He collected, and drilled personally, an effective army; established forts and *guardias* at short intervals along the frontier rivers, and defeated the Indians of the Chaco, who were getting troublesome. He shut up the country so completely that not a single native could quit it, and the few foreigners who succeeded in getting in had marvellous difficulty in getting out again. He allowed only a few trading vessels to ascend as high as Nembucú, a town a short distance above the embouchure of the Paraguay; he examined the manifests of their cargoes, selected what he needed, arms and ammunition especially, paid for it in *yerba mate*, and sent them away immediately. . . . He raised money by forced contributions from the wealthy, and shot those who appealed against his estimate of their means; but he did not appropriate one farthing to his own use, and remained poor, although the whole revenue of the Republic passed through his hands. He made the country self-supporting, and want was unknown within it. Too intelligent to fear the sensual and illiterate priests who administered the offices of the Church, he curbed their power, laughed at their dogmas, and despoiled them of their wealth. He abolished the *diezmo*, an unequal and oppressive tax, and compelled the indolent farmersto adopt a better system of agriculture.

“ He did much good, but was terribly severe and irritable; and, haunted by a constant fear of assassination and revolt, in his late years he became a moody, bitter, and cruel tyrant, absolutely without a friend or a single joyous hour.”

In fact, Francia's career was the *reductio ad absurdum* of “personal government.” By the most earnest and self-denying devotions to the interests of the country as he understood them — personally drilling the cavalry, personally laying out the streets of Asuncion with his own theodolite, personally examining the manifests of trading vessels, and in

every conceivable manner toiling on behalf of the idlest race on earth—he attained the dread and hatred of large masses of his countrymen; he lived in perpetual fear of murder, and, although his precautions in that respect were successful, they were evidently not unreasonable. Over his remains a solemn funeral oration was pronounced, and they were solemnly interred in front of the altar in the Church of the Incarnation at Asuncion; but the next morning the tomb was empty; some coward's revenge had flung the old man's body to the alligators of the Paraguay. This last fact had apparently not reached Carlyle, when he wrote, "O, Francia, though thou hadst to execute some forty persons, I am not without some pity for thee!"

On the death of Francia, the Congress again appointed two Consuls, Carlos Lopez and Alonzo; and again, after a brief interval, the stronger put the weaker out of his way. It is said that at first they both signed all documents in one line, denoting equality of power; afterwards Lopez signed first, and Alonzo underneath him as second. At last, however, Carlos Lopez, father of the General Lopez whose name will ever be the most notorious in the history of Paraguay, dismissing his colleague without much ceremony, was appointed President of the Republic, on the 13th of March, 1845.

The condition of the country, under the government of the first Lopez, appears to have been extremely happy. The rigour of the rule of Francia was, in a measure, relaxed, especially in reference to intercourse with foreign countries. The navigation of the river was thrown open; the country declared accessible to foreigners for trade or residence. A fortnightly line of steamers was established between Asuncion and Buenos Ayres, and many foreigners, especially Englishmen, were induced to enter the service of the Government as engineers, mechanics, and men of science. Some of them, like Mr. Masterman, had bitter cause to regret their credulity when times of trouble came.

This would have been the time for the English traveller to visit Paraguay, and to form his impressions of the character of its population. It was a mixed race of the blood of the Spaniard and the Indian, the conqueror and the conquered. Some of the families assumed to belong to a real aristocracy of blood, and did not condescend to intermarry with the Indians. But, as in England after the Norman Conquest, the language of the conquered people prevailed. The mixed races did not speak the noble tongue of their Castilian fathers, but the softer Guarani of their Indian mothers. Mr. Master-

man moralises thus concerning the character and the destiny of these *mestizos* :—

“The Spaniards committed two grand mistakes in South America—enslaving the aborigines, and intermarrying with them. The first, a cruel wrong to the Indians; the second, an irreparable injury to themselves, for in place of raising the race they mingled with, they sank themselves to the lower level. And the folly has brought retributive punishment for the crime. The endless intestine wars of the turbulent, indolent, and lawless *mestizos*, their wholesale butcheries of each other, which have depopulated whole provinces, are but the result of that primary error. Nor will they cease, I fear, until the whole mixed race has disappeared, and the descendants of the oppressor and the oppressed shall have been alike annihilated by the terrible vengeance demanded for the atrocities of the conquistadores. Had they only acted as wisely, in that respect, as our colonists did in North America, and had ‘no dealings with the heathen,’ how different the result would have been!”

It may be doubted whether the difference in this respect between North and South America did not arise, under God’s providence, as much from the different characters of the Indian tribes as from that of the European settlers. Other questions of similar tendency might be asked. Indeed, the subject of the proper relation of a conquering race to a conquered one is not to be so easily settled. India on the broad scale, and New Zealand on a very narrow one, warn us that we have not mastered the problem yet.

This mingled race was scattered over the interior of Paraguay. Twenty thousand lived in the capital city, Asuncion, on the bank of the river which gave its name to the country. The other towns were small, and, as all foreign trade was restricted to Asuncion, they were not built near the river, whose low and marshy banks showed few signs of human existence for hundreds of miles. The appearance of the people, the coarse black hair, the smooth and beardless face, the olive brown complexion, indicated their Indian blood, while their manners exhibited much of the courtesy of the Spaniard, who is, perhaps, the finest gentleman in Europe. When some of the English mechanics in Asuncion were made warrant officers, and admitted to the public balls, their more educated countrymen blushed to see them by their uncouthness and their excesses place themselves far below the level of the Paraguayans, whom they despised and insulted. The dress commonly worn was peculiar and very picturesque. That of the men was similar to that of the *gauchos* of Buenos Ayres. “Fringed drawers, a kind

of kilt of white cotton, a broad belt, or rather double apron of dressed leather, a white shirt, often handsomely embroidered, and a poncho, which is simply a piece of woollen cloth about two yards square, with a hole in the centre to put the head through. A straw hat, and enormous silver spurs, weighing, perhaps, two pounds apiece, complete the costume." The dress of the women was simpler still. A long cotton chemise, called *tupoi*, cut low in the neck, and deeply embroidered round the upper edge in scarlet or black, a skirt of muslin or silk fastened round the waist with a broad sash, and "puffed out by starched petticoats," appear to have suggested to Mr. Masterman classic reminiscences, which the Spanish, and therefore almost Pompeian, architecture of the Paraguayan houses tended to intensify. "The resemblance became almost an illusion, if sitting when night was falling in a large saloon, dusky with shadow, one saw a servant clad in a *tupoi*, falling from her shoulders in snowy folds, the whiter from the broad black scrolls to its edge, bearing a vase-shaped water-jar on her head, and with rounded pendent arms, elastic and silent step, passing through the pillared corridor. One would almost believe that a caryatide had left her heavier burden, and had come, in living flesh, before us." The better classes, resident in the capital, dressed very brilliantly in the European mode.

There was little hard work in Paraguay, and there was no want. Each family, however poor, could plant in a few days its maize, its mandioca, and its tobacco, and the fertile soil and the genial climate did the rest. Oranges, too, which grow wild, are a considerable article of food. Cotton is indigenous, and was spun with the distaff and woven by the travelling weaver. The sugar-cane grows freely, but the manufacture of sugar was not brought to any perfection. There was a spirit called *caña*, distilled from molasses, but the people in general were very abstemious. Their amusements were smoking, dancing, and sipping *yerba*, or Paraguayan tea. *Yerba* is the dried and powdered leaf of the *Ilex Paraguayensis*, a tree which grows to a large size. It contains a principle similar to that which exists in tea and coffee, and supplies the favourite beverage of nearly all South America. The infusion is made in a gourd, or *maté*, from which it is drawn up by means of a tube with small perforations at the end, exactly in the style of a sherry-cobbler, only that it is scalding hot. This article was the only source of revenue in Paraguay. It was all purchased by the Government, and was in such demand in the neighbouring States that the *arroba* of twenty-five pounds,

which cost one shilling, was sold for from twenty-four shillings to thirty-two. There were no taxes, and no crimes of violence. Murder, like the yerba maté, was a monopoly of the Government.

There is, of course, a reverse to this picture, which any thoughtful reader could easily supply. There was no security for property, as against the wants or the cupidity of the Government, that is, of the President and his family. The form of Roman Catholicism which existed among the Paraguayans was only a gaudier idolatry than the rude Indian religions it superseded. And the state of social morality was what might be divined from the utter absence of religious principle. They were, for instance, dexterous and incurable thieves. Mr. Masterman was present at a ball in the country, and remarked that each gentleman wore his hat when he danced, and held it in his hand when he sat down, evidently from a well-founded doubt of his neighbour's honesty. He says, too, with perhaps a little flippancy, "It is somewhat ungenerous to speak of the morals of one's friends, so I will only say that incontinence before marriage is not looked upon there as a serious fault, but I never heard of a faithless wife the whole time I was in the country." As, however, he describes the population as stationary, if not actually decreasing, before the outbreak of war, and does not hesitate to trace the fact to the prevalent moral corruption, it is manifest that the state of the people was worse than he has cared to describe. The same unwilling testimony to a fact not to be ignored proceeds from Colonel Thompson. He says, "Marriage generally was discouraged by Francia, and hence arose the immorality to which the lower classes gave way, though rarely the higher. Their morals were not, however, in reality so bad as would be supposed; for although the marriages were not celebrated in church, the women were nearly as faithful as if they had been regularly married, with the difference that, as the tie was not irrevocable, when two people found they did not agree well they separated." This is a sufficiently explicit description, and we can only express our sorrow at the spirit in which such a disclosure is made.

In such an Epicurean paradise lived the Paraguayans all the days of the first President Lopez. He never came into serious collision with the neighbouring States, and he had no difficulty in maintaining internal quiet. The people had been trained to order; first the Indians by the Jesuits, and then the higher class by the strong hand of Francia. With no taxes to pay, the mass of the people would know nothing of the Government but by the security it gave to person and property,

which is said to have been complete as against every assailant but itself, and by the schools it maintained throughout the country, in which every boy was taught reading and writing and the first rules of arithmetic. In Francia's time, the pressure of his personal authority was felt everywhere. Lopez, on the other hand, interfered with nothing that did not appear to involve danger to himself or to his power, and did everything he could to promote the intercourse of Paraguay with the more civilised nations of Europe. It was with the latter view that he sent his eldest son, General Lopez, in the year 1854, to visit various European Courts. He was in England, France, Spain, Germany, and Italy. In Paris he remained some time, dazzled with the magnificence of the great capital, and especially with the military glories of the *grande nation*, and forming, as was subsequently imagined, vague aspirations at being the Napoleon of the New World. He brought back with him, not only those desires, but a companion perhaps more dangerous—a beautiful, talented and ambitious woman, who has been regarded as the evil genius of his life and of his country.

Madame Eloisa Lynch was of Irish origin, though born in France, and married to a surgeon of the French army. She had considerable personal attractions, which she knew how to display and to enhance by the magnificence of her dress. She had acquired the mastery of several European languages, speaking English, French, and Spanish with equal facility. She was agreeable in society, and appears to have retained her influence over Lopez to the last, going wherever he went, never doubted by him, even when he was torturing his nearest kindred under the suspicion of a conspiracy against him, never forsaking him until he fell on the battle-field. Whether she was indeed the Lady Macbeth of the tragedy of Paraguay, and Lopez a mere instrument in her hands, will perhaps never be known; the few persons who were admitted to intimacy with them having nearly all perished.

It is evident, however, that Lopez returned from Europe filled with a great project, either suggested by Madame Lynch or originated in his own mind, to prepare a powerful army and an ample supply of *matériel*, and, as soon as supreme power should come into his hands, to fall upon the neighbouring States and subdue them, and so to erect an empire in South America which might in due time rival the great Republic of the North. Two things favoured the project: the first, the distracted and enfeebled condition of the Republics of Banda Oriental and Buenos Ayres; and the second, the

confidence with which the old President committed all military matters to the care of his eldest son. Hence it arose that under the government of a man who is known to have said that he would rather give up one-fourth of his dominions than go to war, an army was assembled of eight-and-twenty thousand men, a number utterly disproportioned to the population of the country and to any dangers which might probably assail it, while stores were prepared for the equipment of three or four times that number.

In due time, on September 10, 1860, Lopez I. died. He left five children, three sons and two daughters, all of whom had grown enormously rich by the most unscrupulous extortion, which no one had the courage to resist. The sons bought cattle at their own price, and sent them to the market, where no one else was allowed to sell cattle while any belonging to the President's family were there. The ladies established an exchange, bought up the torn and ragged paper money for new paper at a discount of sixpence in the dollar, and as they received full value for it at the Treasury they must have had good reason to bless the "paternal government." He had, however, taken care that no one in the country should be in a position to compete for the Presidency with Francisco Solano, his eldest son, General-in-Chief of the Army, Minister of War, and Vice-President of the Republic. It is true that the fundamental doctrine of the Constitution was that the office of President was not hereditary, but all the power by which the election would be decided was in the hands of the person whom that doctrine seemed to exclude.

General Lopez assembled a Congress within a month of his father's death to elect a new President. The deputies met in the Cabildo, at Asuncion, surrounded by a strong body of troops under the command of the candidate. In the course of the first day's sitting one or two deputies raised some slight objections to the course suggested. They did not reappear the second day, having been arrested during the night. Benigno Lopez, the youngest son of the old President, who had shown some sympathy with the Opposition, was banished to his *estancia* in the North. The rest of them were fettered and imprisoned. Of course the Congress proceeded immediately with profound unanimity to elect the citizen Francisco Solano Lopez President of the Republic of Paraguay and Commander of the Armies.

This is, perhaps, the place to present the portrait of the hero of the tragedy we have to record, and we cannot do better than adopt the language of Mr. Masterman:—

"The new President was born on the 24th of July, 1826, and was, therefore, thirty-six years of age when elected. Personally, he is not a man of very commanding presence, being but five feet four in height, and extremely stout—latterly most unwieldily so. His face is very flat, with but little nobility of feature, head rather good, but narrow in front and greatly developed posteriorly. There is a very ominous breadth and solidity in the lower part of his face, a peculiarity derived from his Gaucurú ancestry, and which gives the index to his character—a cruel, sensual face, which the eyes, placed rather too close together, do not improve. His manners when he was pleased were remarkably gracious; but when enraged, and I have twice seen him so, his expression was perfectly ferocious; the savage Indian broke through the thin varnish of civilisation, as the Cossack shows in an angry Russian."

Colonel Thompson's volume has a portrait of General Lopez for its frontispiece, which proves the foregoing description to be singularly accurate.

It is very possible for those who have lived in familiar intercourse with men of high station to fail to recognise the abilities which their actions prove them to have possessed. Lopez had some of the qualities which constitute greatness. He had great influence over men. His charm of manner must have amounted to fascination; there must have been something sublime in his hypocrisy. Thompson assures us that he considers him to be a monster without parallel; but although he resided eleven years in the country, and was apparently attached to his staff during the greater part of the war, he did not discover his character before the latter end of 1868. "His manner was such as entirely to dispel and throw discredit on any whispers which might be uttered against him." He knew, as well as his pattern, the First Napoleon, how to win the hearts of the soldiery with a word or with a jest; and so he retained his personal popularity to the last, at least in the ranks of the army which was dying for him. And the story of the war proves him to have been fertile in expedients, and eminently prompt and decisive in action. Errors enough are recorded as having been committed by him; but he may be regarded as a Hannibal in comparison with the men that were pitted against him. He had also a faith in himself and in his cause, and a dogged resolution under difficulties which would have been worthy of a hero. And yet he was anything but a hero. Not one generous action is recorded of him; no portion of his conduct appears to have had any higher motive than his personal interest. Of self-sacrifice, of patriotic devotion, of family affection, and even

of the truth and honour of a gentleman, he was alike incapable. He trusted no one, he loved no one but himself and Madame Lynch. Colonel Thompson shows him not to have been conspicuous for personal courage. He never headed armies, or led sorties, or guarded entrenchments. His place was always in the rear of the army, where he sipped his choice claret in his luxurious house, well screened by earthworks and by casemates, while his people were dying by hundreds and thousands in the front. And yet for this man, and for nothing else, the Paraguayan nation has perished. It is not the case of a man who was the organ and representative of the spirit and character of his people, speaking their thoughts, and fighting for their ideas. His countrymen—lazy, luxurious, and contented—wanted nothing but cigars and *yerba*, a poncho to lie down upon, and an orange grove to screen them from the sun. The one political characteristic on which he relied, was that which had been growing for centuries, the habit of obedience to constituted authorities. Ignorant of the outer world, and of the resources of their enemies, the docile Paraguayans followed the leading of their President until almost the entire male population perished, and the beautiful country became a desert; and, even when he was driven to the woods and the mountains, a handful of devoted men still clung to him and held at bay the overwhelming forces of the allies until his death released them from their allegiance.

At the time of his accession the Treasury was rich, and he speedily began to utilise the military stores he had accumulated by gathering an army of upwards of 80,000 men, and preparing for war.

The questions upon which the war commenced were in themselves comparatively trivial; but a feeling of hostility between Paraguay and the Empire of Brazil had been rising for some years previously. At a bend of the river Paraguay, and near the point where it falls into the Paraná, a few batteries had been armed by the Paraguayans, and the little fortress, afterwards well known as Humaitá, was gradually strengthened so as to command the river. Now the river was the high road from the Brazilian province of Matto Grosso, which lies north of Paraguay, not only to Europe, but to Rio Janeiro itself, the road by land being almost impassable. Brazil, therefore, considered that the waters of the Paraguay ought to be free, and accumulated military stores in Matto Grosso, with the evident intention of some day destroying Humaitá. The boundary question also was still un-

settled; and in proportion as the population of the country and the strength of the rival Powers increased, would evidently grow more difficult of solution. There were, therefore, two subjects of discussion, which might at any time lead to war. They might, however, have smouldered long, and perhaps have been extinguished by some pacific arrangement, if the elder Lopez had survived, or if his spirit had animated his successor.

The state of things, however, in the Republic of the Banda Oriental, of which Monte Video is the capital, was such as to afford a tempting opportunity to display the influence of Paraguay. As usual, one party was in possession of the Government, and their opponents had been banished; and, as was not unusual, the chief of the banished party, Flores, had returned and headed an insurrection against the existing Government. Thousands of the *gauchos*, the wild herdsmen of the New World, flocked to his standard, and the civil war went on for upwards of a year without any definite result. The Brazilian Government regarded this as a suitable moment to press certain claims for compensation to Brazilian subjects who had been outraged by Oriental troops upon the frontier, and, on the rejection of these claims, Brazil made common cause with Flores, proceeded to open hostilities, bombarded the little town of Paysandú, and invested Monte Video itself. The President and Government immediately took to flight, and Flores was re-elected President of the Republic, and invested with extraordinary powers.

Lopez had watched these occurrences most carefully. At first he offered his services as mediator between the contending parties in the Banda, and when Brazil openly espoused the cause of Flores he directed a protest to the Imperial Government, challenging its right to interfere in the politics of the River Plate, and declaring that he would not look on calmly while the laws of nations were outraged. Both his mediation and his protest were received with scorn; the newspapers of Monte Video and of Rio Janeiro heaped ridicule on his pretensions, and the course of events in the Banda was apparently unaffected by them. While Lopez was brooding over the contemptuous rejection of his protest, and was apparently undecided as to the course he should adopt in consequence, an opportunity of striking the first blow presented itself, and he was unable to resist the temptation. A passenger steamer, the *Marquez de Olinda*, belonging to a Brazilian company, and trading between Rio Janeiro and the province of Matto Grosso, left for the latter place on her re-

gular trip, passing Humaitá, and steaming up the river Paraguay towards her destination, thus placing herself entirely in his power. She was a fine vessel, better than any in the Paraguayan navy, which was composed only of small river craft, hastily armed as gunboats; she had on board the newly-appointed Governor of Matto Grosso, and a large sum of money intended for the payment of the troops. On the other hand, as war had not been declared, the seizure of an unarmed ship would be mere piracy, without any plausible ground of justification. Lopez evidently hesitated, permitted her to pass Asuncion unmolested, but ultimately ordered the *Tacuari* to follow her and bring her back. This was easily accomplished; the Governor was made prisoner; the steamer was armed and added to the Paraguayan navy; the money proved to be in Brazilian paper, and was, of course, useless to Lopez. The first act of war, the first step in that fatal career which brought desolation into every home in Paraguay, was the seizure of the *Marquez de Olinda*.

Lopez next proceeded to invade Matto Grosso with a force of 3,000 men, conveyed by the *Tacuari* and two smaller steamers, under the command of his brother-in-law, General Barrios. The only serious resistance they encountered was at the outset, at Coimbra, a fort commanding the river entrance to the province, which is, as we have previously explained, practically the only entrance; the alternative being nine hundred or a thousand miles of road, so bad that carts occupy three months in making the journey. The first attempt at capturing the place by assault cost the Paraguayans 200 killed and wounded; but the next day, preparations having been made for a more regular attack, it was found that the garrison had disappeared during the night, leaving everything behind them, guns mounted and unspiked, a well-furnished magazine, and private property of great value. Thenceforward the entire province was an easy conquest. The Brazilian soldiers, utterly disheartened, took to flight on every opportunity, leaving sometimes even cannon loaded, which they had been in too great a hurry to discharge. The country was pillaged, the Baron de Villa Maria, the richest man in the province, leaving his beautiful house, with its costly furniture and pictures, as the spoil of the conquerors, put a bottle of diamonds in his pocket and fled. His two sons were captured and executed, and he owed his life to the swiftness of his horse, and riding across the country to Rio Janeiro was the first to bring the news of the disaster that

had befallen the empire. The Paraguayans brought down the river many cargoes of gunpowder, arms, and ammunition, besides three steamers, seventy cannon, and five hundred prisoners.

This was the second step in the war, and, as a military movement, was well devised and successful. A land expedition, under Colonel Resquin, moved in a parallel line with the flotilla, and, though meeting with little resistance, contributed essentially to the completeness of the conquest. Paraguay was not only relieved from the necessity of watching the garrison of Matto Grosso, but had henceforward full command of the resources of a hitherto hostile country. But, unquestionably, this first success, inflaming the pride of Lopez, and mortifying, in proportion, that of Brazil, contributed much to the desperate and internecine character of the struggle that was to follow.

In the meantime the Empire of Brazil and the new Government of Monte Video had settled all matters pending between them, and had declared war against Paraguay. As if this combination were not sufficiently formidable, Lopez demanded permission of the Argentine Republic to march his troops across the province of Corrientes to assail Monte Video; and when the demand was refused he declared war. Before the document declaring it had reached Buenos Ayres, he sent five war steamers down the river, which captured the city of Corrientes, and took possession of two small vessels belonging to the Argentine Government lying there. Three days afterwards a declaration of war was issued by the Government of Buenos Ayres, amid the utmost popular enthusiasm and indignation; and on the first of the following month, May 1, 1865, the Triple Alliance was signed, uniting the three Governments of Brazil, the Argentine Republic, and the Banda Oriental for offensive and defensive war against the Republic of Paraguay.

This important document is given *in extenso* by both Colonel Thompson and Mr. Masterman. One of its articles provided that it should remain secret until the principal objects of the alliance should be attained. At the demand of the British Government, however, a copy was furnished, and was printed nearly a year afterwards in a Parliamentary Blue-book, whence it reached South America, and obtained for Lopez a considerable amount of sympathy. According to the text of the treaty, the principal objects to be secured were the entire overthrow of the existing Government of Paraguay, the destruction of the fortress of Humaitá, a distinct under-

standing with the future Government that no similar erection should obstruct the free navigation of the rivers Paraguay and Paraná, the removal of all arms and war material found in the country, and the rectification of the frontier according to Brazilian ideas. The allies professed that they intended to leave Paraguay free and independent, but responsible for the entire expenses of the war.

The terms which the contracting parties designed to impose on Paraguay were certainly exceptionally severe; the overthrow of a national Government by external force, and the complete disarmament of an independent country, appear to involve a chastisement and humiliation beyond what even the offences of Lopez merited, or the necessity of the case required. It was evident also that no nation possessed of the slightest vestige of military spirit could submit to such terms until its utmost powers of resistance had been crushed; and it had been resolved that Paraguay should be crushed accordingly. The Republics of La Plata were alarmed at the military power which Lopez had gathered around him, and at his evident disposition to employ it for purposes of aggression; perhaps, even the French uniforms of his officers suggested involuntary recollections of the long wars of Europe against the First Napoleon, and they resolved to do at once in Paraguay what the banded nations did at last in France. The Government of Brazil, on the other hand, the Russia of South America, seized the opportunity of accomplishing very important objects. The guns of Humaitá should no longer command her communications with one of her most important provinces, and the rectification of the frontier should transfer to herself the district of the *yerbales*, the natural woods of the *yerba maté*, the most valuable of the productions of Paraguay. Whether she might not have constructed military roads or even railways across her empire, and so opened the coveted communications at a less cost than was expended in a long and wasteful war, may be another question. Brazil was the only power engaged in the contest which could hope to gain anything by it.

A glance at the map of South America suggests the inquiry, what could justify a country like Paraguay in provoking hostilities with enemies so superior in territory, in population, and in advantage of position, and how was it that so unequal a contest endured so long?

The strength of Paraguay for military purposes was partly in the character of its Government, which, though nominally republican, was really a military despotism so complete that

it is scarcely exaggeration to say that Lopez could command the last dollar in the country and the last man. It was partly in the girdle of swamp and forest which protected her on the only side on which invasion was probable—the banks of the Paraguay and the Paraná; and it was partly in the superior military quality of her population. The Paraguayans made splendid soldiers, temperate, and therefore watchful, obedient to orders, with all the Indian fearlessness of death, and with a dash of the Castilian chivalry. The armies to which they were opposed were chiefly drawn from the population of Brazil, the character of which has been lowered by the constant intermixture of negro blood with that of the Indian and the Portuguese. The Paraguayans called them *cambas*, or blacks, *macacos*, or baboons, and entertained a degree of contempt for their courage and prowess which the history of the war goes far to justify.

On the other hand, the weakness of Paraguay was not only in the smallness of the territory and of its population, but especially in her position. The blockade of a single river was sufficient to exclude her from all intercourse with the civilised world. In time of peace this appeared of little moment, for no nation was less dependent upon commerce for the necessities and comforts of life. But war requires a constant supply of material such as tropical America cannot produce. English mechanics in the arsenal of Asuncion and elsewhere did what could be done to supply the most pressing necessities. Gunpowder was made, though not of first-rate quality, the sulphur being obtained from iron pyrites, and the nitre from urine and other animal substances. The lining membrane from the intestines of oxen was tanned and used in making cartridges. Paper almost disappeared from the country, until Mr. Treuenfeldt made it from the fibre of the wild pine-apple, whereby the *Semanario*, the organ of the Government, was enabled to maintain its existence. Many of the cannon in store at the commencement of the war were old guns that had been brought out as ballast and purchased by the Paraguayan Government. Thompson compares them with those which do duty as posts upon Woolwich Common. The arsenal, however, turned out some beautiful pieces; one was a twelve-ton gun, throwing spherical ten-inch shot, which was cast from bells contributed by all the churches in the country, and was in consequence called the "Christian;" another was a ten-ton gun, cast after another levy had been made of the remaining church bells, and of all the copper boilers and saucepans in the country, and bored and rifled to fit Whit-

worth's 150 pounder shot, supplied by the batteries of the enemy. Many other guns were produced by the same ingenious artisans; but as the war went on the difficulty of procuring needful materials became greater and greater. Cannon balls and fragments of exploded shells were gathered, and sent to the arsenal in immense quantities; but all was not sufficient, and thousands of pounds' worth of machinery was melted down into missiles. The sick and wounded in the hospitals depended on the care of English surgeons, and the supply of drugs being exhausted very early could only be replenished from the indigenous productions of the country. Fortunately these were ample; Paraguay is the paradise of the enthusiastic apothecary. "There were plenty of astringents amongst the mimosas, carminatives enough, euphorbial purgatives, and I made absorbent mixtures in a roundabout way from the mountain limestone; for quinine we gave arsenic; calomel we manufactured; but opium, which we needed more than all, was not to be replaced. I had planted a quantity of poppy plants, but they were all destroyed by the cattle one unlucky night." A far more serious deficiency was the scarcity of salt, which must have cost the lives of thousands.

The obvious remedy for all this would have been the possession of a fleet sufficient to secure the command of the river. This would have made Lopez practically unassailable in Paraguay, while it would have placed Buenos Ayres and Monte Video at his mercy. If he had contemplated war so long as he is supposed to have done, it is difficult to imagine how he allowed himself to be satisfied with a little flotilla of passenger steamers, against which the allies had it in their power at once to direct a force of vessels built for war, and finally a powerful navy of ironclads. Even one or two swift and powerful vessels, built and armoured for river warfare, might have altered the aspect of things materially. It is evident that Lopez intended to rely on the guns of Humaitá to keep the hostile fleet from threatening Asuncion, while he took the field with the army he had been so carefully preparing, and marched on Buenos Ayres or Monte Video. There were doubtless financial reasons also, sufficient to make the purchase of ironclads undesirable, if they could be dispensed with; it is even possible that Lopez hardly knew or appreciated the importance of the change in naval warfare which has taken place during the last few years. But, however it was made, the error was irreparable. Paraguay could be blockaded in the most effectual manner by a few

vessels lying anywhere in the river Paraná below Corrientes; and from the beginning of the war it was blockaded accordingly. A path was made through swamps and forests, and across unbridged rivers, to reach Bolivia on the Pacific coast, but it was found impossible to use it for the transport of goods. Twice in the history of Paraguay it has been as much isolated from the world as Japan; once by its own Dictator Francia, and again by the act of its enemies.

If the naval preparations were inadequate, the recruiting for military service did not err on that side. In the beginning of 1865, Lopez had 100,000 men under his command. Considered in connection with the population and resources of the country, the number was preposterously large. It was as though the British Government should call out an army of three millions at once from the population of these islands. And it must be understood that these enormous levies were made before the Triple Alliance was signed, and at a time when the independence of Paraguay and the Government of Lopez had not been assailed or threatened; and that it was the rumour of these hostile preparations which united the neighbouring Powers against him. Mr. Masterman says very judiciously:—

“It was one of the great mistakes made by Lopez, withdrawing from industrial pursuits so many men at once. The whole population before the war was about a million, and one-tenth, and that the flower of the males, from producers, suddenly became consumers of food; for some time that was plentiful enough, as far as beef was concerned, but they got nothing else. Now, the Paraguayans, unlike the Argentines and Orientals, are not exclusively carnivorous; in fact, in the interior, they ate little meat, consuming in preference maize, mandioc, and oranges. These men were all at once sent to Humaitá, a damp, malarious place, where they could scarcely get a particle of vegetable food, and during the cold, wet winter; the result was, as might have been predicted, a most intractable form of diarrhoea, pneumonia, and enteric fever. The wretched sheds of hospitals were crowded, and soon became themselves *foci* of disease; and that fine army melted rapidly and ingloriously away; the gravedigger was soon more active than the drill-sergeant.”

The blockade commenced in June, 1865, when a Brazilian fleet of nine war steamers, two of which were ironclads, was stationed in the river Paraná, a few miles below Corrientes. The Paraguayans having nearly an equal number of vessels, resolved to attack the blockading fleet at its moorings, and, if possible, to capture it. The idea was sufficiently daring, the Brazilian vessels being built for battle, while those of the

Paraguayans were armed passenger boats, liable to be disabled by a single shot striking any part of the exposed machinery. In weight of artillery also the Brazilian fleet was immeasurably superior, although an attempt was made to render matters more equal by the construction of six flat-bottomed boats, called *chatas*, each carrying an eight-inch gun, and towed into action by a steamer. In obedience to orders the Paraguayan flotilla steamed down the river, passed the Brazilian fleet, firing at them, and being fired at in return, then turned and steamed up towards them against the stream, still towing the *chatas*. The object of this manœuvre was to cut off the retreat of the Brazilians, whom their enemies believed to be ready to run away at the first opportunity. The result of it was that one of the Paraguayan steamers received a shot through the boiler in passing downward, which placed her *hors de combat*, and also that the Brazilians had time to get under way, and to employ, to the best advantage, their superiority in ships and guns. The ironclad, *Paranhyba*, was boarded, and was for a few minutes in the possession of the Paraguayans; but was rescued by two of her consorts. The battle, however, was too unequal to remain long undecided. Three more of the Paraguayan steamers were shot through the boiler, two of which, as well as the first victim, were entirely lost. One of them was the ill-gotten *Marquez de Olinda*, which drifted down the river, was stranded on a bank, and shortly disappeared under water. Another was run down by the Brazilian flagship, which drove her on a bank, where she was abandoned and burnt. The four remaining retreated, and presented themselves the next morning at Humaitá. The Brazilian vessels had suffered severely from the artillery of the Paraguayans, and one was destroyed, having stranded opposite a little battery they had established ashore.

The battle, however, was lost and won; and there is not much exaggeration in saying that the loss of that battle decided the issue of the war. Paraguay could not build steamers in place of those she had lost; the opportunity of capturing those of the enemy was gone. Brazil, on the other hand, withdrawing her ships to a safe distance from the Paraguayan guns wherever they were placed upon the bank, could still keep the river blockaded; and while excluding her enemy from all commerce with Europe, could bring iron-clads, built in English establishments, one by one across the Atlantic, until she had a force that could pass the batteries of Humaitá, and operate in aid of the invading army. From

the date of the naval action, called the Battle of Riachuelo, the allies possessed an advantage which rendered the ultimate victory of Lopez almost impossible.

Captain Meza, the commander of the Paraguayan fleet, arrived at Humaitá severely wounded. He was landed and cared for, but received a message from Lopez, that if he recovered he would be shot for cowardice. Happily, the old man died, or Lopez would certainly have kept his word.

In the middle of April, 1865, immediately after the capture of the two Argentine steamers at the city of Corrientes, the Paraguayans invaded the province in two divisions. One division, landing at Corrientes, occupied the western side, and sent to Lopez stores of all kinds, the spoil of the riverine towns. The other, composed of 12,000 men, under the command of General Estigarribia, invaded the eastern side of the province, and marched forward with the avowed intention of assailing Monte Video. The same audacity of conception, and the same contempt for the enemy, which sent the fleet to its destruction, characterised the plan of this campaign. Eight hundred miles of hostile country were to be traversed; two large rivers, the Paraná and the Uruguay, to be crossed; the combined armies of the allies were to be overcome; and the entire force allotted for the purpose was a division of 12,000 men, cut off from reinforcements and dependent on the country around them for their supplies. They reached the river Uruguay at San Borja, and Estigarribia crossed into the Brazilian province of Rio Grande, leaving a corps of 2,500 men under Major Duarte on the right bank. The two divisions marched down the river in parallel lines, and in sight of each other, though unable to co-operate, until Estigarribia reached the town of Uruguayana, and Duarte that of Yataí, on the opposite bank. There they were both surrounded by the enemy, who had been steadily gathering from all sides. Duarte was assailed by an army of 13,000 men, and, after a desperate resistance, his entire force was destroyed; the Paraguayans refused quarter and fought to the last; only two or three hundred prisoners were taken, and scarcely a man escaped. A still larger army threatened Estigarribia, who threw himself into the town with his whole force, now amounting only to 8,000 men. Brazilians, Argentines, and Orientals surrounded him, to the number of 30,000, with gunboats on the river; and the Emperor of Brazil and the Comte d'Eu, his son-in-law, were present in person. To a summons to surrender he returned an answer ascribed by Thompson to a priest; we should rather have attributed its

paternity to a schoolboy. Referring to the information the allies had given him as to their numbers and their artillery, he says :—

“ I am not of the same opinion as your Excellencies, that a military man of honour, and a true patriot, should limit himself to fight only when he has a probability of conquering.

“ If your Excellencies open any history, you will learn, from the records of that great book of humanity, that the great captains, whom the world still remembers with pride, counted neither the number of their enemies nor the elements they disposed of, but conquered or died in the name of their country. Recollect that Leonidas, when he was keeping the Pass of Thermopylæ with three hundred Spartans, would not listen to the propositions of the King of Persia, and when a soldier told him that his enemies were so numerous that their arrows darkened the sun, he answered, ‘ So much the better—we will fight in the shade.’ Like the Spartan captain, I cannot listen to propositions made by the enemy; for I have been sent, with my companions, to fight in the defence of the rights of Paraguay, and as its soldier I must answer your Excellencies, when you enumerate to me the number of your forces, and the amount of artillery at your disposal, ‘ So much the better; the smoke of the cannon shall be our shade.’ ”

A few days afterwards, finding that his provisions were almost gone, and that the allies were preparing for an attack, which their immense superiority of force would render decisive, having also been upwards of three months without any communication from Lopez, he prudently surrendered his army as prisoners of war, September 18, 1865.

The rage of Lopez at this disaster was extreme. Although the fault was manifestly his own, in having detached the division, and left it unsupported in a hostile country, or rather, perhaps, because it was so, he charged Estigarribia with having sold the garrison, and held him up to the scorn of the whole army as a traitor. He immediately ordered the rest of his forces to evacuate the province. The army was deployed into as long a line as possible from the river eastward, and marched homewards, sweeping all the cattle and horses before them to the Paraná, which they crossed in safety, bringing over 100,000 head of oxen. The Brazilian fleet came up, and might easily have prevented their retreat until the army which had captured Estigarribia should reach and destroy them; but they seem to have been glad to let them go.

So closed the first stage of the war. Lopez evidently designed taking the command of the invading army in person,

and marching on Monte Video and Buenos Ayres. If he had undertaken such an enterprise at the outset of the war, and pressed rapidly forward with all the forces at his disposal, he might not improbably have succeeded. His preparations were far advanced, while the allies were altogether unprepared. Now, however, it was too late. He had lost one half of his army before the first year of the war was ended. Diarrhœa and dysentery, measles and small-pox, that is to say, change of diet and neglect of sanitary laws, had cost him near 40,000 men, in addition to the surrendered column of Estigarribia. The allies were preparing to bring to bear their immense superiority of resources, and the war was henceforth the struggle of an exhausted country against overwhelming and increasing power.

It was at this time, before the graver events of the war began, that Mr. Masterman visited Humaitá for the purpose of inspecting the hospitals. There was nothing attractive in the place, and the works were insignificant compared with what they afterwards became. There is, however, one episode in the account which places before us, in a very lively picture, the Supreme Chief of the Republic, and his great satellite, parasite, and spiritual adviser, the Bishop of Paraguay.

"I had intended to have stopped a week, but was detained nearly three, and for a reason so absurd that I cannot recall it without laughing.

"President Lopez had ordered from Paris a peep-show, such as one sees at fairs in England, but on a very grand scale, and a phantasmagoria lantern. They arrived safely shortly before the river was blockaded, but unfortunately the printed directions for setting them up were mislaid, so his Excellency ordered Captain (now Lieutenant-Colonel) Thompson and me to arrange and exhibit them. We were not very well pleased with such a task, but of course obeyed.

"When ready for display, Lopez, accompanied by the Bishop and three or four generals, made the tour of the exhibition to the sound of martial music, and attended by us as showmen. We had great difficulty in preserving our gravity, the childish delight and misconceptions of our fat patron were so absurd, as he stood on tip-toe to gaze through the bull's eyes at the 'Bay of Naples by moonlight,' or a 'Chasseur d'Afrique engaging ten Arabs at once.'

"The magic-lantern scene was more ridiculous still. . . . Many of the slides represented scenes from the recent Franco-Italian campaign, but we took the liberty of re-christening some of them thus:—'Battle of Copenhagen, between the Persians and the Dutch.' 'Ah, that was a terrible affair,' said Lopez, patronisingly, to the Bishop. 'The field of Trafalgar after the battle, Mamelukes removing the wounded.' 'What Christian humanity, sire!' softly observed the

Bishop. And so we went on. 'Capture of the Jungfrau in the final charge at Magenta,' cried Thompson, with an unsteady voice, and kicking my shins under the table; and 'Death of General Orders at the Moment of Victory,' was the title of the next, which sounded very imposing in Spanish, and closed the series. Then came the comic scenes, when the Bishop was very nearly the death of us. There was light enough reflected from the screen to see him distinctly, and his contortions, as he tried with handkerchief stuffed into his mouth to stifle his laughter, were excruciatingly diverting. He dared not laugh out, yet his delight at the figures, especially at one, where the nose of a dwarf gradually reached portentous dimensions, was utterly beyond his control."

The allies did not cross the Paraná for the invasion of Paraguay until the 17th of April, 1866. Battles took place between them and Lopez on the 2nd and on the 24th of May. In the former the advantage was on the side of the Paraguayans, who captured several cannon, and destroyed the Oriental division, which constituted the vanguard. In the latter they were completely routed, and the greater part of the army destroyed; only 10,000 men, scattered in all directions, and utterly disorganised, were at last re-assembled. The allies might have gone forward at once to finish the war by the capture of Lopez' entrenched camp. They hesitated for six months, during which time the Paraguayan position was strengthened in every possible way, and the rake of the conscription, having had its teeth set a little closer, brought up 10,000 recruits. Then, in the beginning of September, they attacked Curuzú, a post on the bank of the river which had been armed during their delay. The works were bombarded by ironclads, one of which, the *Rio Janeiro*, after having her 4-inch plates twice perforated by 68-pound shot, had a hole blown in her bottom by a torpedo, and sank almost immediately, the greater part of her crew, together with her captain, being drowned. The next day the bombardment was continued, and Curuzú was assaulted on the land side and captured. A delay of three weeks more took place, during which there was a perfectly useless interview between Lopez and Mitre, the commander-in-chief of the allies. They then assaulted, by land and water, the works of Curupaty, a little higher on the river, to which Curuzú had been but an outpost. They were repulsed with very heavy loss, and, in consequence, remained fourteen months inactive, making no attempt at advancing till February, 1868.

All this time Lopez was at Paso Pucu, his head-quarters in the rear of the army, where he had a comfortable house, and

every luxury of life. Finding that it was within the range of heavy artillery from the river, he had an earthwork fifteen feet high made for his protection. Once he ventured out during the intense anxiety of the assault on Curupaty; but the whistling of a ball overhead sent him scampering in again with unseemly haste. The allies advancing some batteries on the land side about four miles off, he had another earthwork made of much larger dimensions; and, finally, a casemate was built of immense logs of ironwood, and covered with nine feet of earth. His aide-de-camp says, "He had a peculiar kind of courage; when out of range of fire, even though completely surrounded by the enemy, he was always in high spirits, but he could not endure the whistle of a ball." So hard is it to judge of the real characters of men, developing new aspects under changing circumstances. The "peculiar courage" of Lopez, when tested on his last battlefield at all events, proved to be the old-fashioned courage of which all nations furnish examples in time of need.

During this time there was one bloody battle; Lopez assaulted the lines of the allies, and, although repulsed, contrived to carry off fourteen guns, including a Whitworth thirty-two pounder. There were two attempts at mediation, one by Mr. Washburn, the American Minister, and a second by Mr. Gould, *Chargé d'Affaires* of her Britannic Majesty, both of which failed on the same point, the resignation of supreme power by Lopez. The allies were determined to carry out that portion of their programme, though willing to forego almost every other, and Lopez was resolute not to abdicate. The allied forces grew stronger, in spite of the waste of disease and battle; their fleet was reinforced by the addition of several ironclads; and Paraguay was reduced to the utmost misery, the flower of her male population having already perished in the war.

In August, 1867, the Brazilian ironclads passed Curupaty, and, six months afterwards, they ran by the batteries of Humaitá, suffering but little damage. This was the beginning of the end, and there appears no good reason why it had been delayed so long. Lopez, in danger of being surrounded and cut off from his supplies, was compelled to break up his camp, to quit his comfortable home at Paso Pucu, and to withdraw his army to a new position on the north of the river Tebiquari. Curupaty was abandoned, the heavy guns being replaced by "quakers," or sham guns made of wood, whose terrors kept the allies at bay for a month. Asuncion, the capital, being now open to the ironclads, was, at the command of Lopez,

deserted by all the inhabitants—men, women, and children. Humaitá was closely invested, and, the supplies of provisions being entirely cut off, it was evacuated on the 24th of July, 1868, more than three years having elapsed since the allies doomed it to destruction. Compelled again to retreat northward, Lopez entrenched himself behind the watercourse of Pikysyry, and constructed a battery and fort at Angostura, on the Paraguay. By this time his army had been reduced to 10,000, most of whom were boys or old men, the last gleanings of the conscription. In December, 1868, his lines were captured, and his head-quarters bombarded, and ultimately taken by storm. Lopez escaped to Cerra Leon, attended only by Madame Lynch, the American Minister, General MacMahon, and a mere handful of men. Colonel Thompson, who was in command of the fortress of Angostura, held by 800 combatants against an army of 20,000 men, and a fleet of ironclads on the river, receiving authentic evidence of the rout and dispersion of the Paraguayan forces, accepted honourable terms of capitulation, on the 30th of December, 1868. At that date, therefore, Lopez had no longer an army, or a stronghold, or probably a single cannon. The war was apparently over; his flight or capture within a few weeks at furthest was confidently calculated upon; but such was the invincible energy of the man, and the influence he exerted among his countrymen, and such were the difficulties presented by the dense and trackless woods, and the unknown passes of the cordillera in North-Western Paraguay, that he was enabled to hold out for fourteen months longer. The other members of the Triple Alliance, satisfied with their success, and utterly weary of the war, retired from active co-operation in it, and it was reserved for Brazil to complete the programme. On the 1st of March in the present year, Lopez was brought to bay on the banks of the river Aquidaban, and refusing, according to the Brazilian accounts, to surrender, he died sword in hand. Thus terminated the career of one of the most remarkable men of the present generation.

It will now be necessary for us to look behind the scenes, and to reveal something of the internal condition of Paraguay during the war, and of the reign of terror by which so desperate a resistance was sustained. Under various pretexts almost the whole wealth of the country was appropriated by the Government. Portable property was of course particularly acceptable, and the ladies of Asuncion, and finally all the women in the country, were required to present their jewellery as a patriotic offering. In some cases, the owners of landed

estates were required to bring their title deeds for examination ; the deeds were of course declared irregular, and the property transferred to the Government, that is, to Lopez. The wearing of mourning was absolutely forbidden, lest its universal use should bear evidence to the ravages of war. The relatives of any who were supposed to have deserted to the enemy were compelled to curse and disown them in the public prints.

These, however, are minor matters in comparison with what remains to be told. In the month of July, 1868, Asuncion having been evacuated, the fall of Humaitá being imminent, and everything portending the catastrophe, it was announced that a conspiracy had been discovered, in which many of the highest officials, and most of the foreigners resident in the country, were implicated : the Treasury also was said to have been robbed of a large sum of money. Under these charges hundreds of people were imprisoned, tortured, and executed. Palacios, Bishop of Paraguay ; Bergès, late Minister of Foreign Affairs ; Leite-Pereira, the Portuguese Consul : and Don Benigno Lopez, the younger brother of the President, were amongst those who were put to death ; Don Venancio Lopez, the elder brother, very narrowly escaped the same fate. No enumeration of names can produce so deep an impression as the following paragraph :—

“ Just in the rear of my hut the two sisters of Lopez, Dona Inocencia de Barrios and Dona Rafaela de Bedoya, were imprisoned, each in a covered bullock-cart or *carreta*, about seven feet long, four wide, and five high. They remained, poor ladies, shut up in these moveable prisons for more than five months. I often saw them wheeled past on their way to the *fiscales* ; the front and the windows had been blocked up, and the door behind was secured with a padlock ; but an opening had been made in front, about six inches high, through which, I suppose, their food, &c., would be handed in to them. Many times I heard young children crying there, but I do not know if they were theirs. The sufferings they endured almost exceed belief. About December, 1867, their husbands incurred the displeasure of Lopez, probably by urging him to make terms with the allies, and they with their families were ordered down to San Fernando. Early in the preceding year they were put under arrest. Don Saturnino Bedoya was at first charged with having robbed the Treasury (he was *Tesorero-General*), and afterwards with complicity in the pretended plot ; he protested his innocence, but was put to the torture, which was applied so severely that they dislocated his spine, and he died in intense agony. General Barrios, in order to escape so terrible a fate, tried to commit suicide ; but his courage failing him, I suppose, he only inflicted a slight wound, which was

dressed, and the day afterwards he was shot. His wife and her sister were taken from their prison, and they were compelled to witness his execution. They, very naturally, poor women, in their grief and despair, expressed their detestation of the barbarous and unnatural cruelty of their ferocious brother; this was reported to him, and he *ordered them to be flogged* in a manner outraging decency and all feelings of humanity, which was at once carried out. Not content with this, he sent them back to their prisons, and forced them by threats of worse treatment to depose falsely against their murdered husbands; and in December, 1868, he compelled his mother to leave her house at La Trinidad, where she had remained virtually a prisoner for two years, and go to Luque, the temporary capital, and there, before the altar of the church, swear that she recognised Francisco Solano alone as her child, and cursed the rest as rebels and traitors. She piteously pleaded her advanced age (she is about sixty) and disease of the heart as excuses for not complying; but the officer charged to see that her son's orders were carried out told her she must obey or die, and she went. I think the whole sad history of human crime cannot show one record exceeding this in heartless cruelty."

At the capture of Lopez' head-quarters, in December, 1868, a book was found containing a sort of diary of the proceedings in connection with this alleged conspiracy; the names of 596 persons were given, 220 being foreigners, who had been executed or had died in prison.

Of course there was no conspiracy; vague conversations, implying regret at the condition and prospects of the country, there may have been; but no action was taken or contemplated. The most natural interpretation of the conduct of the tyrant would appear to be that it was an outbreak of that savage cruelty which is latent in the Spanish-Indian blood, maddened by his approaching downfall. But Colonel Thompson, who knew him well, and who had no share in any of the sufferings we describe, suggests a still darker origin for them:—

"There can be little doubt that the object of Lopez in all this was to get into his hands all the money, public and private, existing in the country; and that, at the same time, he profited by the opportunity to put away every one against whom he had the least spite. The robbery of the Treasury was a thing impossible to be done in Paraguay except by himself, on account of the manifold systems of espionage always at work, especially in this department. After ordering all the public moneys to be deposited in his own coffers, and most probably buried in different parts of the country, he had *every one* who had anything to do with the Treasury or public offices, or with his private stewardship, taken down to the army and mur-

dered, so that there is no one alive now who has the remotest idea where the Paraguay Treasury money is, except himself. All the merchants and others who had any money were treated in the same manner. . . . Much of the money thus obtained was, doubtless, taken away by some of the neutral war-vessels which visited Angostura at the end of 1868."

Colonel Thompson elsewhere describes the shipment of a number of very heavy cases from the fortress of Angostura on board French and Italian steamers, which he supposes to have contained some of the ladies' jewellery, the patriotic offering of 1867, as well as the missing doubloons from the Treasury. Few persons will be found prepared to adopt this terrible hypothesis.

The death of Lopez on the battle-field may, perhaps, cause a reaction of public sympathy in his favour, and probably he may be represented ere long as the patriot hero, the Wallace, or the Hofer, of Paraguay. It must not be forgotten, however, that he might have given peace to his country on the most honourable terms by simply retiring from the Government at a time when any military man ought to have known that the contest was hopeless. He spared nothing to perpetuate his rule in Paraguay, neither the wealth nor the lives of his countrymen, neither the lives nor the honour of his nearest relatives. As the conflict became desperate, he looked for increasing devotedness; on the rumour of disaffection, or even of lukewarmness in his service, "the savage Indian broke through the thin varnish of civilisation," and he spared neither sex nor station. The whole country was literally in a state of siege, and it was simply by the resolute sacrifice of everything to the one object of resisting the invaders that it was enabled to hold out so long. It is very possible that he sent treasure to Europe, both to save it from falling into the hands of the enemy and to make provision for his children and their mother; but mere avarice was not the master passion of the man. His life and death are the consistent expression of a passion which the world calls noble, because often associated with far higher intellect and culture than those of Lopez, but which has inflicted on mankind more misery than the love of wealth; it is a story of struggling, defeated, and finally desperate ambition, the selfish love of power.

The long war in Paraguay is ended, and a Provisional Government is established at Asuncion. Whatever honour is attached to the closing operations of the contest belongs to the Brazilian army, and to its commander, the Comte d'Eu.

a Prince of the House of Orleans, and son-in-law of the Emperor of Brazil. The long continuance of the struggle amazes those who were behind the scenes and knew the weakness of Paraguay; they even suggest that the delay must have been intentional, designed by chiefs and generals to increase the profits of army contracts, and by statesmen to secure the utter destruction of Paraguay. It seems needless to suspect such deliberate cruelty. Allied armies always move slowly, and there were peculiar local difficulties, which alarmed the cautious mediocrity of Mitre and Caxias with apprehensions of a great disaster. But, designedly or undesignedly, these five years of war have ruined Paraguay. The allies may, perhaps, carry out their original treaty, and guarantee the independence of the country. But the nation is destroyed, and will never rise again. The towns have been sacked and deserted, the farms forsaken, cattle and property of all kinds carried away, and, worst of all, the men, or nine-tenths of them, even down to the little boys that could barely handle the musket, have been swept away by the relentless conscription and buried in the swamps. Another race may enter and may occupy the land; perhaps it may be reserved for our countrymen, or for some branch of a kindred stock, to enter it and to make the desert rejoice again; but the old Paraguay, the people that seemed racy of the soil with its half-developed capabilities, the people so kindly and hospitable at home, so gallant and devoted on the battle-field, is gone for ever. They have perished for a cause that was not worthy the devotion of a dog. They have died for Francisco Solano Lopez.

In taking leave of this subject, we would express our gratitude to our countrymen who have made us acquainted with the facts of this tragic history. Colonel Thompson, indeed, might well say, "*quorum pars magna fui*," for, although he by no means obtrudes his personal services to the Paraguayan cause, they were evidently of the very highest importance. Indeed, this is the greatest fault we have to find with him; a man of his correct feelings would not have allowed himself to be actively engaged in such a warfare if he could have foreseen its character and its issues. His little book is packed full of facts. Mr. Masterman writes like an accurate observer of nature, and, as our readers have had occasion to observe, in a remarkably free and flowing style. His intelligent delight in natural beauty, his affection for the Paraguayan people, among whom he met with much personal kindness, his unaffected interest in the poor fellows in the

hospital under his care, his manly endurance when imprisoned eleven months in a dark cell, whence he came out at last with hair turned grey, and with an aspect such as his countryman and near neighbour failed to recognise,—and even his enthusiastic observation of the manners and customs of the cockroaches, scorpions, and spiders that shared the cell with him,—all will make every English reader proud of his countryman; while the record of his tortures by the horrible *cepo d'uruguayana*, the rack of South America, under the charge of being engaged in the pretended conspiracy, brings home to us those “dark places” in the heart of man which are full of the habitations of cruelty. We have seldom read a more interesting book; but, delighted as we should be to meet Mr. Masterman again, we hope that neither he nor any other English gentleman may have again such a tale of sorrow to unfold.

ART. III.—1. *The History of the Life of Albrecht Dürer of Nürnberg*, with a Translation of his Letters and Journal, and some Account of his Works. By MRS. CHARLES HEATON. Macmillan and Co. London. 1870.

2. *Albert Dürer; his Life and Works*, including Autobiographical Papers and Complete Catalogues. By WILLIAM B. SCOTT, Author of *Half-hour Lectures on the History and Practice of the Fine and Ornamental Arts*. Longmans, Green, and Co. London. 1869.

In the architectural aspect of cities, as in other things, "the old order changeth, giving place to new," and doubtless, on the whole, the change is right and lawful. But even to those who can acknowledge the advantage of wide and healthy streets, of increased facilities for locomotion—who recognise that each succeeding generation has the first claim to the accommodation which the world affords—even to those there is something often inexpressibly sad in the rapid disappearance of the relics of the past. There are cities—Paris in chief—whose topography occupies a place in the history of mankind, and whose memories are harshly disturbed by wholesale demolition, and the substitution of those rectilinear streets that "are rather monotonous in an art point of view," as M. Thiers once said. There are others, like Rouen, where the stucco and plate-glass of to-day harmonise ill with the grey tones and quaint diversity of former times; and others again, like Florence, which are suffering from the influx of a new population and the erection of suburban villas. Much of the change is inevitable; some of it, as we said, is right. But still it is impossible to watch without regret the parting of the visible links that bind us to the past, the transformation of the scenes among which our forefathers played their part in life's drama.

Fortunately, however, in the case of the great German artist of the Reformation, we are not reduced to a painful conjecturing of the outward influences by which he was surrounded. What Nuremberg was when Albert Dürer occupied the house in the Zissel-strasse that still bears his name, it still is in its essential features:—a town picturesque and irregular, huddled within its fortifications at the foot of a sandstone rock which is surmounted by a castle, the rock itself being set in the midst of a dry but fertile plain. It is a town of narrow streets and unsymmetrical houses—houses

with high-pitched red roofs, and overhanging "dormer" windows; a town breathing of thrift and industry, whose peculiar character Mr. Ruskin has defined as a "self-restrained, contented, quaint domesticity." In one respect, indeed, the place has changed since the fifteenth century. Then it was a busy manufacturing and commercial centre.

- "Nuremberg's hand
Goes through every land,"

was the proud saying of the citizens. Its wares were sent to every market in Christendom. Now its manufactures are quite unimportant, and commerce flows through other channels. But, even with this deduction, there are still enough of the old elements to enable us to picture to ourselves the free imperial city of those days, to people it with its busy burghers and comely house-wives, to conjure up its paternal government of Rath (or Council) and its many guilds.

And the account which Albert Dürer himself has left of his parentage and earlier years comes to us fraught with the spirit that dwelt in those old walls. There is a pathos in its homeliness and simplicity; and, moreover, it throws so gentle a light upon the artist's own mind, and contains so succinct and yet so real a record, that we shall not venture to weaken it, as Mrs. Heaton has done, by a paraphrase. It will be observed that he never mentions his father without some expression of endearment or respect. The "family history," drawn up in 1524, when the writer was fifty-three, runs as follows:—

"I, Albrecht Dürer, the younger, have sought out, from among my father's papers, these particulars of him, where he came from, and how he lived and died holily. God rest his soul! Amen.

"Albrecht Dürer, the elder, was born in the kingdom of Hungary . . . at a village called Eytas, where his family occupied themselves with oxen and horses. My grandfather was called Anthony, and he betook himself to the town when still a young man, and learned the goldsmith's art. He married a maiden called Elizabeth, and they had four children, one girl, Catherine, and three sons. The eldest son was Albrecht, my dear father, who became also a goldsmith, and was a skilful and truthful man. . . My dear father travelled into Germany, and also lived long in the Netherlands, knowing there many great artists. He at last came here to Nuremberg in 1454, on St. Louis' Day* (August

* This is the date given by Mr. Scott. The *Edinburgh Review*, for July, 1861, says St. Aloysius. Mrs. Heaton says St. Eligius' Day (25th June), 1455. The German, as given by Campe, is St. Eloye, and we hold the right translation to be Eligius, or in French Eloi, a saint well known in French nursery rhymes.

25th), the very day on which Philip Pirkheimer held his wedding, and there was a great dance under the lime trees. Then my dear father entered himself with Joseph Haller, who became my grandfather; for, after a long service, up to the year 1467, my father having asked him for his daughter Barbara, then a fair and handy maiden of fifteen, they were married eight days before St. Vitus. . . . My dear parents had between them all these children that follow, as I have copied them from the book word for word."

After this follow no less than eighteen entries, of which the *third* is as follows:—

"At six o'clock on St. Prudentia's Day, the Friday in Holy Week,* 1471, my house-wife bore another son, to whom Anthony Koberger was godfather, and named him after me, Albert."

The eighteen entries copied from the record kept by his father being ended, the narrative continues:—

"All these, my dear father's children, are now dead, some very young, some living a little longer, except three; and those who still live, as long as God pleases, are Andrew, Hans, and myself Albert.

"My father's life was passed in great struggles, and in continuous hard work. With my dear mother bearing so many children, he never could become rich, as he had nothing but what his hands brought him. He had thus many troubles, trials, and adverse circumstances. But yet from every one who knew him he received praise, because he led an honourable Christian life, and was patient, giving all men consideration, and thanking God. He indulged himself in few pleasures, spoke little, shunned society, and was, in truth, a God-fearing man.

"My dear father took great pains with his children, bringing them up to the honour of God. He made us know what was agreeable to others as well as to our Maker, so that we might become good neighbours; and every day he talked to us of these things, the love of God, and the conduct of life. For me, I think, he had a particular affection, and, as he saw me diligent in learning, he sent me to school. When I had learned to write and read he took me home again, with the intention of teaching me goldsmith's work. In this I began to do very well. But my love was towards painting, much more than towards the goldsmith's craft. When at last I told my father of my inclination, he was not well pleased, thinking of the time I had been under him as lost if I turned painter. But he let me have my will; and in the year 1486, on St. Andrew's Day, he settled me apprentice with Michael Wohlgemuth, to serve him for three years. In that time God gave me diligence to learn well, spite of the pains I had to suffer from the other young men. And when the three years were out, my father sent me away. I remained abroad four years, when he recalled me; and

* There is considerable doubt respecting the exact date meant.

as I had left just after Easter in 1490, I returned home in 1494, just after Whitsuntide. And now, when my *Wanderjahre* was over, Hans Frey treated with my father, and gave me his daughter, by name the jungfrau Agnes, with a dowry of 200 guldens. Our wedding was held on the Monday before St. Margaret's Day, in the year 1494."

So far speaks Dürer; and in order to set his narrative in its true frame, and to realise the precise period of history to which belong the twenty-three years that elapsed between his birth and his settling down as an artist in Nuremberg, it is only necessary to remember that the year 1471 carries us back to the reign of our own Edward IV., to the Wars of the Roses, to a date anterior to the murder of the Princes in the Tower; that when Dürer was about twelve, Luther was born; that when he was twenty-two, Columbus brought back to Ferdinand and Isabella the wondrous news of the lands lying beyond the western sea. As regards the arts, never has there been, before or since, a quarter of a century so prolific of genius. Within its span were born Michael Angelo, Giorgione, Titian, Raphael, Sebastian del Piombo, Andrea del Sarto, Correggio, and Holbein, to name but the greatest. In short, these three-and-twenty years coincided with the setting of the Middle Ages, with the dawn of the Renaissance, the seed-time of the Reformation, the commencement of a wonderful series of maritime discoveries and commercial enterprises—a period big with great things and crowded with great men.

Of Dürer's life during these years scarcely anything is known beyond what he himself has told us; and the ingenious conjectures that have been made respecting the precise localities which he visited during his student years are idle in the extreme. One record of his childhood, however, should not be passed over. It is a portrait, now in the Albert collection at Vienna, and of which there is a copy among the Dürer drawings in the British Museum,—a portrait of the lad as he was at the age of thirteen, and bearing this inscription, added in subsequent years: "This I have drawn from myself from the looking-glass in the year 1484, when I was still a child." The face, notwithstanding the relative imperfection of the drawing, is interesting and thoughtful, almost melancholy. The eyes are large and intelligent; the nose long, delicate, and slightly aquiline; the mouth small but full; the forehead hidden by the hair, which is cut across it in mediæval fashion. Nor was the promise of physical beauty, to which this portrait bears witness, belied in after life. All his subsequent portraits confirm it. And

he was very proud of this beauty, and took great pains to preserve it, and to set it off to the best advantage, not apparently from any foppish feeling, but simply from an artist's delight in what was pleasant to the eye.

We have said that there is little to be added to Dürer's account of his early years. There is little also to be gathered respecting his training as a painter. Of the extent to which he was influenced, whether for good or evil, by the master to whom he was apprenticed by his father, it is difficult to form a very accurate estimate. For though pictures attributed to Wohlgemuth are not rare in German galleries, yet few are well authenticated, and we do not recollect having come across any in this country. So far as we can gather, however, he seems to have been a painter of no particular originality or feeling, executing his work in a dry and archaic manner. Tradition asserts that Dürer also studied under Martin Schongauer, usually called in admiration Martin Schön, but of this there is no direct evidence; and, as the older master is supposed to have died between the years 1486 and 1488, any prolonged intercourse must have been impossible. The negative testimony of Dürer's silence is also very strong. But he is known to have been received with affection by Schön's brothers; and though Schön himself may never have taught him anything by word of mouth or direct personal example, there can be no doubt of the influence of his works. In the case of one or two early engravings, indeed, Dürer did not disdain to copy his predecessor, the difference of the monogram showing, however, that no deception was intended. But, even apart from direct imitation, there is great similarity of spirit and workmanship between the two men. Schön had certainly less genius and versatility, less grasp of thought and power of hand. He is more rugged and ungraceful. Nevertheless, there are those among his works which remind us forcibly of Dürer, and which the latter need not have been ashamed to sign. The "Christ Bearing the Cross" is one of them.

In estimating the works which Dürer produced during the thirty-four years that elapsed between the date of his settling down in Nuremberg and his death—in trying to appreciate the value of his legacy to the world—it is necessary to bear in mind the form of art to which those works belong. Raphael, with whom he had corresponded and exchanged drawings,* said of him, "Truly this one would surpass us

* There is a sketch in red chalk in the Albert Collection at Vienna bearing

all had he, as we have, the masterpieces of art always under his eyes." It was a generous exclamation—we should expect no less from such a speaker—and get only the expression of a half truth. The antique would have done little for Dürer; it would not have been to him what it was to the great Italian artists of the Renaissance, the food on which their genius was nurtured and fed. He belonged to a different art family, to one equally prolific of great things, and equally entitled to recognition and honour. For if to the one family we are indebted for the architecture and the poetry of Greece and Rome, for the painting of the Renaissance, for the drama of Racine, Corneille and Molière—these are, of course, but flying illustrations—to the other we owe all that is mere poetry in Isaiah and the Psalms, Gothic architecture and the plays of Shakespeare. This is an old question, of course. It was contested fiercely in France by the generation of 1830, which divided itself into two hostile camps, that blazoned the words "classical" and "romantic" on their banners. But a settlement by ordeal of battle proved impracticable. Passions have now grown cooler. It is gradually being discovered that the world of art is large enough to include both ideals. The efforts of later writers have been directed rather to defining the limits of the influence of both schools—not, however, very successfully. For the spirit which animated them has embodied itself so fitfully in various races, periods, and individuals, as to elude any very exact classification—whether it be that of M. Taine, who regards the difference as inherent to the Teutonic and Latin races, or of Mr. Matthew Arnold, who would have us consider it as distinctive of the Hebrew and the Greek.

It is not our intention to attempt any exhaustive analysis of the principles by which the two schools are animated. Suffice it to say, generally, that while the "classical" artist, be he poet, painter, architect, or sculptor, regards art as the setting in order and presentation of what is beautiful and dignified in Nature, to the exclusion of all that is inharmonious, ungraceful, or obscure, the "romantic" artist looks upon art rather as the mirror of nature, seeking less to order and arrange than to grasp and give form to its shifting multitudinous details, its contrasts, and even its uglinesses. This is susceptible of a great variety of illus-

this inscription in Dürer's handwriting: "Raphael di Urbino, who is so highly esteemed by the Pope, has drawn this study from the nude, and has sent it to Albrecht Dürer, at Nuremberg, to show him his hand," i.e. mode of execution.

tration. It will be enough for our purpose, however, to show the immense difference that separates the designs and engravings of Dürer from those of his great Italian contemporary, Marc Antonio, whose best works were executed from Raphael's drawings, and in his studio under his immediate eye. In the latter the engraver's object has evidently been beauty, beauty not of texture and technical detail—in this we judge that he did not approach his German rival—but beauty of form, grace of line, and harmony of composition. There is no crowding, no triviality, no physical ugliness—though sometimes, be it said, moral deformity. But if we turn to Dürer's works we find ourselves in a different world. The sublime, the beautiful, the pathetic, the homely, the grotesque—though never, be it said to his honour, the impure—all are inextricably mingled. In the most solemn scenes of the Passion he does not hesitate to introduce his favourite dog, a funny little animal, something between a French poodle and a Skye terrier. In one of his Madonnas a chained monkey sits complacently in the foreground. In another two or three rabbits frisk gaily. The pigs in the engraving of the "Prodigal Son" have evidently been touched with a loving hand. The figures who crowd the scenes of Our Lord's life wear the features and quaint garb of the burghers of Nuremberg, in the fifteenth century. Gossips sit tasting the caudle in the lying-in chamber at the birth of the Virgin. In two of the woodcuts of the *Apocalypse* the doleful faces given to the Sun and Moon produce a very strange effect. Vasari says, that when Dürer "had to design from the nude form, for want of better models, he took one or other of his apprentices, and these must have had very ill-formed figures; as, indeed," adds the Italian, "the Germans generally have when they are undressed, although one sees many in those countries who appear to be fine men when they are dressed." Fine or not fine, dressed or undressed, Dürer drew the world as he saw it, and hence his work has in it a most attractive element of life.

His first important work—the woodcuts of the *Apocalypse*, published in 1498—may be described as a great attempt to grapple with the impossible; for the imagery of what Milton described, in his majestic prose, as a "high and stately tragedy, shutting up and intermingling her solemn scenes and acts with a sevenfold chorus of hallelujahs and harping symphonies"—that imagery is unpaintable. Barely can words, which are a far vaguer vehicle than drawing, convey to the mind any adequate idea of the sights witnessed by St. John

at Patmos when he was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day. The pencil is powerless to deal with forms that are unfamiliar, or bear no analogy to those we habitually see. We may, for instance, by a vigorous exercise of the imagination, conceive the grandeur, rather than the definite appearance, of a Being whose "head and whose hairs were white like wool, as white as snow, and his eyes as a flame of fire, and his feet like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace," and who had "in his right hand seven stars," and out of whose "mouth went a two-edged sword, and whose countenance was as the sun shining in his strength." But, evidently, any endeavour to paint such a being could only result in something grotesque and almost monstrous. And this is only one instance among many of the pictorial difficulties of the Book of the Revelation. Still, in Dürer's case, the old adage, that it is "great to fail in great attempts," holds good. There is a single-minded realism and literalness in his designs, an evident desire to draw what St. John saw, which—to say nothing of the passages of quiet beauty in the underlying landscapes, and the quaint power of the conceptions—give a great charm to these works. Mrs. Heaton—and the extract may serve as a specimen of her style at its best—says of the fourth cut:—

"What other artist than Albrecht Dürer could have rendered with such fierce breathing life that awful figure of Death on the pale horse treading down in avenging wrath the fourth part of the earth? Unlike the other riders, who appear urged on by some mighty impulse to fulfil God's judgments on mankind, Death seems driven by fierce demoniac rage. Hell, indeed, follows close behind him in the shape of the wide-opened jaws of a monster into which a king-crowned head is sinking. Even the horse he bestrides betrays a feeling of devilish spite that is quite different to the noble anger of the animal ridden by the rider who swings the balance aloft with mighty outstretched arm."

This is partly true; and yet, with all their malice, there is something of decrepitude, both in the steed and the grisly spectre who bestrides him, that harmonises ill with our conception of the mighty conqueror to whom, and to whose terrible train, was given "power over the fourth part of the earth to kill with sword, and with hunger, and with death, and with the beasts of the earth." Another very fine cut is that in which Michael is thrusting his spear with both hands into the dragon, who sinks in the air beneath him. The face, which is that of a man in middle age, is stern and set; and, though Satan and his angels are defeated, it is not without effort. And here again it is impossible not to con-

trast this design, crowded with the tumult of conflict, and that picture of the same subject by Raphael, now in the hall of masterpieces at the Louvre, in which the young conqueror, radiant and irresistible, springs on to the shoulder of his prostrate foe, and spears him as he passes.

These woodcuts of the *Apocalypse*, which are most vigorously executed, and created a revolution in the art of wood engraving, raise a very interesting question, viz., whether Dürer cut his own blocks, or contented himself with drawing his designs on the wood. Mrs. Heaton thinks that, as regards this first work, he did so cut them. She thinks so partly on technical grounds, and partly because he could not probably at that date have been able to pay any one to do the work for him. Indeed, looking at the previous condition of the art, it seems unlikely that he could then have found any one qualified for the task. But, as regards his subsequent woodcuts, the case is different; and the arguments advanced by Jackson, in his *History of Wood Engraving*, tend to show that, in all probability, the mechanical part of the work was not done by Dürer.

The most important of these subsequent woodcuts are the three series entitled the *Life of the Virgin*,* the *Great Passion*, and the *Little Passion*, all published in 1511. They consist, in all, of some sixty-nine prints, which are of the most varied character—homely, for the most part, in the scenes from the life of the Virgin, and often grand and pathetic in those from the life of Our Lord. Perhaps the most purely beautiful—we do not forget the fine figure of Adam in the descent into hell—is that of the Madonna sitting with her child in the crescent moon. But her betrothal is also very graceful and idyllic, and her crowning in heaven a grand conception. As regards the *Passion*, no artist, with whom we are acquainted, has more thoroughly realised the idea of Our Lord as the Man of Sorrows, bowed down by the weight of the sins of the world.† Some of the other prints are marred, like too many pictures of similar subjects, by the exaggerated cruelty of Christ's tormentors, and the needless bar-

* Bernard Palissy incidentally mentions this series in giving expression to a grievance:—"Hast thou not seen also what injury the engravers have done to the scientific painters? I remember to have seen the stories from the life of Our Lady boldly engraved after the designs of a German named Albert, which stories had come into such contempt owing to the great numbers printed, that each was sold for two farthings, notwithstanding that the designs were of a good invention."

† The subject was a favourite one with Dürer. The print to which we here refer forms the title-page to the *Great Passion*.

barity to which He is subjected. Still, here it should be remembered that these illustrated histories were addressed to a strong, coarse age, that possessed but few books, and but a slight knowledge of reading. They were the literature of the people. And there is something in their evident sincerity and bold realism which, apart from the artistic excellences lurking in their quaint and antiquated forms, contrasts very strongly with the flashy designs, so evidently aiming at mere scenic display, of a popular draughtsman who has just illustrated the Bible.

And this leads us to examine a question raised by Mr. Ruskin in a very striking chapter of the fifth volume of *Modern Painters*. In that chapter he describes, with his accustomed and perhaps too hasty eloquence, the sorrow and doubt that fell upon the world when the old faith was shrivelled up in the fires of the Reformation, and "the heavens themselves seemed to have deceived those who had trusted in them." Then men cried:—

"We had prayed with tears; we had loved with our hearts. There was no choice of way open to us; no guidance, from God or man, other than this, and behold it was a lie. 'When He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, He shall guide you into all truth.' And He has guided us into *no* truth. There can be no such Spirit. There is no Advocate, no Comforter. Has there been no Resurrection? And then came the Resurrection of Death. Never since man first saw him, face to face, had his terror been so great. 'Swallowed up in victory!' Alas! no; but king over all the earth. All faith, hope and fond belief were betrayed. Nothing of futurity was now sure but the grave."

And Mr. Ruskin proceeds to consider the effect which this horror of great darkness produced upon two artists very different in themselves and very differently circumstanced, Albert Dürer and the Neapolitan whom Michelet has called, not unjustly, *ce damné Salvator*.

It seems unnecessary very seriously to consider whether such were generally the fruits of the Reformation; at any rate, for those who accepted and hailed it. It may, however, have borne only such a Dead Sea apple for Dürer. But, before examining this, it is as well to note that the engraving of the "*Melancholia*," which Mr. Ruskin regards as Dürer's comment on this sorrowful state of things, was published in 1514; and as Luther's Theses were posted on the doors of the church at Wittemberg only three years afterwards, the comment must, at any rate, be deemed premature. Still, it might, of course, be possible, quite apart from this particular

print, that, with the decay of the old faith, Dürer should become a practical Sadducee, looking upon Death as the unconquered king of terrors, and upon the grave as bounding the horizon of our hopes and fears. It might be possible certainly; who can measure the effect that such an upheaval as the Reformation would produce upon each individual mind? But is there any evidence to this effect? We confess that we know of none. The works on which we have already commented, the *Apocalypse*, the *Life of the Virgin*, the *Great and Little Passion*, breathe, as we think, a spirit of practical, real devotion, untinged, and this is very noteworthy in the woodcuts of the *Life of the Virgin*, with any excessive superstition. These, however, are early productions. But is there any change in those that came later, any hopelessness or denial of the life to come in what is left of his writings? The "family history" was drawn up in 1524, when Luther's blows against the Papal edifice had resounded through Germany; it does not express the feelings of a man whose beloved father was lost to him for ever. The journal of the voyage to the Netherlands, which contains so eloquent a testimony to Dürer's admiration for the great Reformer, seems clouded by no such doubts. And if we turn to the works in which the artist threw his whole soul, to his engravings, and drawings, and paintings, we shall find, indeed, many things hard to understand, many riddles difficult to read, thoughts of sorrow and death, such as oftentimes haunt the darker imaginations of the north; but the desolation of utter scepticism, so far as we can perceive, never. It was no jaded and disappointed inquirer who, in bequeathing his latest works, the large panel pictures of St. Peter and St. John, St. Mark and St. Paul, to his native city of Nuremberg, affixed to them an inscription warning all Christian kings and rulers not to add to or to take from the blessed Word, or to mistake man's wisdom for God's decrees.

We have said that the mystery of Dürer's works is sometimes difficult to unravel. There are several of his engravings that might be instanced in corroboration of what we hold to be a truth, viz., it is vain to express, by means of one art, what can more naturally and completely be expressed by means of another. Detailed word painting of visible objects is, at best, even in the hands of the greatest masters, only a sorry substitute for the painting of the brush. And similarly some of Dürer's deepest thoughts regarding things invisible come to us veiled and uncertain, because he clothed them in form rather than in words. Many of the prints are exceed-

ingly rare, and without the aid of illustrations it is difficult to show this by any great variety of instances. But, fortunately for our purpose, two of the best known are also the most subtle in intention, and have given rise to the greatest variety of interpretation. All are acquainted with that grand engraving—very grand in all technical qualities—of “The Knight, Death, and the Devil,” which, falling into congenial soil, bore fruit in Fouqué’s graceful romance of *Sintram*. How variously this design has been commented upon! To some, to the greater number, the old knight has seemed the type of the Christian warrior. He has left Satan behind him, baffled, but still dogging his course; he does not heed the grisly phantom who holds an hour-glass before him, and from whose horse’s neck rings the sound of a passing bell. For all his horrible attendants, he does not even hasten his charger’s steady steps through the valley of the shadow of death towards the heavenly city of which the towers gleam in the distance. Others again, and this view is strongly advocated by Mr. Scott, hold that the “Christian Warrior” is simply some robber knight—the letter S on the design would point, if this theory were accepted, to a certain Sparnecker executed at Nuremberg in Dürer’s time—some robber-knight bound on a mission of wrong and cruelty. Death and the Devil naturally accompany him on his ride. His carelessness of their presence is the contempt of familiarity. So much for the inculcation of a philosophical or religious truth through the pencil. And so again of the “Melancholia.” To some that strange winged figure, crowned with laurel, and sitting surrounded by the instruments of science, theoretical and applied, is but an embodiment of the sorrowful futility of all knowledge, but an illustration of the bitter words of the “preacher who was king over Israel in Jerusalem, and gave his heart to seek and search out by wisdom concerning all things that are done under heaven,” and declared as the result of his experience that, “In much wisdom is much grief, and he that increaseth knowledge, increaseth sorrow.” Mrs. Heaton holds rather that the “Melancholia” figure is “a glorious devil, large in heart and brain;” and that the old Eve-craving for the forbidden fruit of knowledge is strong in her breast, and, as may be inferred from the objects by which she is surrounded, she has sought it both by legitimate and unhallowed channels.” But this is to forget that, in Dürer’s time, and, indeed, for some generations afterwards, the line of demarcation, which seems so natural to us now, between strict science and the “black art” had not been

drawn. The *Edinburgh Review** considers that the key to the design is to be found in the fact that it was produced in 1514, the year of his mother's death. It would thus be an autobiographical record of the sorrow that had fallen upon him, and of the spiritual perplexity of the time, which his studies had aggravated rather than dispelled. But if the "Melancholia" was intended to be such a record, it seems unaccountable that the objects surrounding the figure should be so exclusively scientific and mechanical. Dürer was a mathematician and engineer, and his purpose here may have been to show that his knowledge could do little for him. Still, if he wished the figure to typify his own soul, he would, we should imagine, have shown by some of the accessories that he remembered he was an artist. Another and very different interpretation has been given of the print, and has been urged strongly on ourselves by an ingenious friend, viz., that as the bat-like creature, who bears the scroll with the inscription of "Melancholia," is flying away, Dürer meant us to understand that one of the most effective cures for melancholy is study and hard work.

We have said, so much for teaching by the pencil. And yet, even as we write the words, we almost regret them. For if these engravings and their fellows of the same class fail to lay any distinct truth or proposition palpably before us, if they fail even to express their own meaning in an unmistakable manner, at any rate they are a strong stimulus to thought. In literature it is not always the clearest writer or reasoner who is the most valuable. There are many men who find better food for their minds, more pregnant and suggestive ideas in the works of Coleridge, Carlyle, or Ruskin, than in those of Mill or Newman. And similarly, in the very process of hunting for the recondite meanings that lurk in several of Dürer's works, there is something refreshing and invigorating.

The same reason that induces us to pass without detailed criticism the great mass of the engravings—the marvellous "St. Jerome" with its play of chequered sunlight, the "St. Hubert" with its fine study of dogs, the "Christ before the High Priest," the "Adam and Eve," the splendid etched landscape with the cannon in the foreground, and so many more—the same reason, we say, will preclude us from entering at any length into the subject of Dürer's paintings and drawings. Indeed, as regards the paintings, it is very much more

* Article on Dürer, July, 1861.

difficult to appeal to the reader's reminiscences than in the case of the engravings, for they are not very numerous, and are scattered all over Europe. Speaking generally, however, so far as our knowledge extends, we will only say that it does not seem to us that Dürer ever attained to a perfect command over colour. He is nearly always wanting in softness and harmony. The accusation is not a new one. It was freely made in his own time. In one of his letters from Venice he tells his friend Pirkheimer that the Italian painters "abused his works, and said they were not according to ancient art, and, therefore, not good;" and, again, when he had completed his great picture of the "Feast of the Rose Garlands" for the German guild in the same city, he writes:—"I have silenced all the painters who said I was good in engraving, but that in painting I did not know how to use my colours." He adds, "Now everybody says they never saw more beautiful colouring." We have not seen this work, so that we cannot offer any opinion whether this praise was, or was not, deserved. It would certainly be misapplied to the pictures we have seen. The design of the "Rose Garlands," though beautiful, is not, we think, equal to that of the "Adoration of the Trinity."

Of Dürer's drawings there is only unqualified admiration to express. There is a collection of them at the British Museum which is quite priceless.* It contains sketches of every variety of subject, from carrots, bullrushes, and birds' wings to landscapes and portraits. All are drawn with a firm and masterly hand that knows no fumbling or hesitation, but does its work with a precision most strong and yet most delicate. In this, as also in a marked individuality, the heads resemble the drawings of Leonardo da Vinci. But they miss that look of mystery and distinction, that subtle complexity of expression, which give an appearance so strangely modern to many of the faces drawn by the Italian.

The incidents of Dürer's life are not numerous. The two most important are his journeys to Venice and to the Nether-

* By-the-bye, would it not be possible to exhibit publicly some, at any rate, of the art treasures in the print department of the Museum? At present they are hidden from all, except a few students; and though the authorities are ready to admit any qualified lovers of art, and are most courteous to them when once admitted, yet this is not the same thing as placing great drawings and engravings within reach of all. There is no question in this of the risk of injuring the works themselves. They would be as safe in glass cases as they are in portfolios. All that we should wish—if it could be done—would be an extension of the arrangement already made for the exhibition of some of the engravings from the Slade bequest.

lands." Before the former, however, his father died. He relates, in the same narrative from which we have already quoted, how, "After a time my father fell ill with a kind of dysentery no one could cure. Soon he clearly saw death before him, and with great patience waited to go, recommending my mother to me, and a godly life to all of us. He received the Sacrament, and died a true Christian on the Eve of St. Matthew, at midnight, in 1502, as I have written more at length in another book." Curiously enough, the only page of this "other book" which the hand of Time has spared is precisely the one containing the passage to which Dürer refers. It tells us how, when the old man lay back on his pillow in the throes of death, an aged nurse "trimmed the lamp and set herself to read aloud St. Bernard's dying song, but she only reached the third verse, and behold his soul had gone. God be good to him! Amen. Then the little maid, when she saw that he was dying, ran quickly up to my chamber and waked me. I went down fast, but he was gone, and I grieved much that I had not been found worthy to be beside him at his end. After this my brother Hans came to live with me, but Andrew we sent away; and, two years later, my mother came to me, having nothing to live upon. With me she remained the rest of her life."

It was rather more than a year after this, towards the end of 1505, that he undertook his journey to Venice. Of the reasons that led to this step nothing is known, and consequently conjectures have been rife. The point, indeed, is not very material. The only explanation deserving of notice is that of Vasari, who says that Dürer went to Venice to obtain protection against the piracies of Italian engravers, and especially of Marc Antonio. That his works were most shamefully imitated by other hands, German as well as Italian, is very true—Marc Antonio's share in the business takes away from the regret we might otherwise feel at the loss of his property on the sacking of Rome by the Spaniards in 1527—but these imitations were not made till after the date of the journey to Venice. And besides, if such had been Dürer's object in leaving his native town, it seems reasonable to suppose that some mention of the steps he had taken in the matter, and of his success or failure, would have crept into his letters to Wilibald Pirckheimer. These letters are eight in number, and furnish a pleasant glimpse into the artist's life at Venice. They are, moreover, pleasant in themselves, cheerful and bantering in tone, and exhibiting the writer to us in a very genial light. The personage to whom they were

addressed was a merchant prince of Nuremberg, a scholar, a diplomatist, a collector of works of art and of curiosities, towards whom we think both Mrs. Heaton and Mr. Scott are needlessly severe. Perhaps he *was* a little pedantic, and possibly a little too patronising in his dealings with his poorer friend, though there is not much evidence on either point. But as Dürer overlooked these defects, if they existed, and as a friendship, apparently very strong and real, existed between the two—a friendship on very equal terms, if we may judge from the tone of these letters—it seems useless, at this time of day, to air a belated grievance against the richer man. It is quite idle to talk of the “trumpery gems” which he requested Dürer to purchase for him. We certainly begrudge the space they occupy in the letters. But really this was not a consideration which Pirkheimer was bound to entertain. And here we may fitly express the opinion we have formed respecting the rival *Lives* of which the titles are prefixed to this article. Both have evidently been a labour of love; both show evidences of great industry and research. The fault of Mrs. Heaton’s is prolixity. When facts fail her she is too fond of conjecture; and her comments on the facts might sometimes be spared. Indeed, she occasionally patronises her hero in a way that we are sure poor Pirkheimer never did. Mr. Scott does not fall into the same errors. Except in one passage of not very deep social philosophy respecting marriage, he moralises little, and the only fault we will find with his narrative is a want of fulness and flow. Both books are readable and interesting, and both are well illustrated—Mrs. Heaton’s sumptuously with photographs taken by the admirable autotype process, and Mr. Scott’s with etchings of his own.

To return to Dürer’s stay in Venice. He seems to have enjoyed himself thoroughly. There were drawbacks, of course, as when his friends warned him not to eat and drink (apparently for fear of poison) with the Italian painters, “many of whom,” he says, “are my enemies, and copy my picture in the church, and others of mine wherever they meet with them;” and again, when he says, “the painters here are very ungracious towards me; they have summoned me three times before the magistrates, and I have been obliged to pay four florins to their school.” So also his dealings in the gems did not always turn out satisfactory. “I bought at first an amethyst,” he tells Pirkheimer, “from a so-called friend, for twelve ducats, but he cheated me in the matter, for it was not worth seven. However, some good fellows arranged the

matter between us, so that in the end I gave him back his stone, and only paid for a fish dinner. I was very joyful at this, and took the money back again very quickly." The last trait is worthy of Pepys. But, notwithstanding these disagreeables, his stay in the beautiful sea city was a season of pleasure. The genial manners of the south pleased one who was himself an excellent companion. "How I shall freeze after this sunshine," he writes in the letter announcing his return to Germany; "here I am a gentleman, at home only a parasite." "I wish you were here, in Venice," he had before written to Pirkheimer. "There are so many pleasant companions amongst the Italians, with whom I am becoming more and more intimate, so that it does one's heart good. There are learned men amongst them, good lute-players, pipers, some having a knowledge of painting; right honest people, who give me their friendship with the greatest kindness." And if the rank and file of the Venetian artists treated him ungraciously, he was well repaid by the courtesy and admiration of the great and venerable John Bellini, "who," he says, "praised me highly before several gentlemen, and wishes to have something of my painting. He came himself and asked me to do something for him, saying that he would pay me well for it. And all the people here tell me what a good man he is, so that I also am greatly inclined to him. He is very old; but yet he is the best painter of them all."

It must, too, we fear, be added, that the absence of the painter's wife—she had been left behind at Nuremberg—contributed not a little to his happiness. The stories of his conjugal infelicity are very numerous, and have been widely disseminated through Leopold Scheffer's clever story, entitled, "The Artist's Married Life." As an old writer quaintly remarks, for the two hundred florins of her dowry Dürer suffered "at least two thousand unhappy days—a pound of silver and a hundred-weight of misfortune." Not that she was unfaithful to him, or profligate. She was only, so far as the very meagre *original* testimony enables us to judge, a woman singularly uncongenial, of a narrow, jealous, and avaricious spirit, and quite unable to enter into the artist's higher thoughts and feelings. He never expresses any complaints in his letters or writings; but there is a want of any affectionate reference such as we might have expected, if all had been well between the two, from one who was so loving and tender to his parents. Their union was never blessed with children, and this may have helped to sour her temper. Pirkheimer's description of

the woman, written after her husband's death, is so damaging that it is, perhaps, scarcely fair to quote it in the absence of distinct corroborative testimony. For he may have been biassed. Still it is the evidence of a man who had been intimate with Dürer all his life, and who had been employed by him in several delicate family matters. No one, therefore, ought to have known the truth better than he. This is what he says:—

“After the providence of God, I can ascribe his death to no one but his wife, who so gnawed at his heart, and worried him to such a degree, that he departed from this world sooner than he would otherwise have done. He was dried up like a bundle of straw, and never dared to be in good spirits or to go out into society. For this bad woman was always anxious, although really she had no cause to be so; and she urged him on day and night, and forced him to hard work only for this—that he might earn money and leave it to her when he died. For she always feared ruin, and she does still, notwithstanding that Albert has left her property worth about six thousand gulden. But nothing ever satisfied her, and, in short, she alone was the cause of his death.”

After a good deal more in the same strain the exasperated philosopher adds:—

“She and her sister are not loose characters, but, as I do not doubt, honourable, pious, and very God-fearing women; but one would rather have to do with a light woman, who behaved in a friendly manner, than with such a nagging, suspicious, scolding, pious woman, with whom a man can have no peace night or day.”

Such as she was she accompanied her husband on his next great journey to the Netherlands in 1520. Respecting the reasons that led to this expedition conjectures have again been numerous. The probability appears to be that it was, at any rate partly, undertaken to obtain from Charles V. the ratification, or rather renewal, of an annual grant of one hundred florins. This grant had been made by the Emperor Maximilian, who, so far as his means would allow, was a great patron of learning and the arts, and who wished thus to reward the artist's labours in connection with the enormous woodcuts that were to commemorate the imperial grandeur. By a decree, dated the 6th September, 1515, this pension, or salary, was made payable out of the annual tax due to the Emperor by the town of Nuremberg; but when he died, in 1519, the town council, with burgher-like prudence, refused to continue their payments, or even to pay certain extra sums for which the artist held the imperial bond, until the appoint-

ment had been confirmed by Maximilian's successor. And though Dürer promised to pledge his house in case the debt were repudiated, he could obtain no redress; and so started for the Netherlands.

The journal of his tour is a quaint, but very interesting production. It rises once, evidently under the influence of very strong feeling, into a passage of stirring eloquence. But, for the most part, it is a record of receipts and expenditure, and of such incidents in the writer's daily life as he wished to remember. He tells us with whom he dines; how much he owes his landlord at various dates; what sums he has "received for art," meaning his works; what sums he has spent in curiosities, of which he seems very fond; what portraits he has taken, or commissions executed; what presents he has made or received; what objects of interest he sees; whom he visits; and how he prospers. The whole forms a most quaintly vivid picture of the busy, joyous burgher-life of the Netherlands at the eve of the Reformation, just a few months before the first victims of the Inquisition were burned at Brussels (July 1st, 1523), and ere the dark cloud of an oppressive war, fraught with a whole century of wrong and ruin, had settled upon the land.

Dürer evidently carried with him a determination to be pleased with what he saw. Though his native town must have accustomed him to the sight of opulence, he was probably unprepared for the wealth of the Low Countries, into which the treasures of America had just begun to pour. One of the first things he visited was the house of the Burgomaster at Antwerp—this city was Dürer's head-quarters. Such a splendid house, he says, he had never seen in all Germany. The cathedral, too—not the present structure, but one shortly afterwards destroyed by fire—excited his admiration. So also did a procession, half civic and half religious, consisting of all the guilds and trades of the city bearing the insignia of their craft. And even in this degenerate nineteenth century the sight is very picturesque. "King Charles's house at Brussels, with its fountains, labyrinth, and park," gave him the greatest pleasure. "A more delightful thing, and one more like a paradise," he had never before seen. But the sight of sights, which gratified his heart more than all, was the collection of treasures brought to the king from the new Golden Land:—

"A sun entirely of gold, a whole fathom broad; likewise a silver moon just as big; likewise all kinds of arms, harness, and wonderful missiles, very strange clothing, bed gear, and all kinds of most wonder-

ful things for man's use, that are as beautiful to behold as they are wonderful. These things are all so costly, that they have been valued at 100,000 gulden, and I have never, in all the days of my life, seen anything that has so much rejoiced my heart as these things. For I have seen among them wonderfully artistic things, and I have wondered at the subtle skill of men in foreign lands, and I do not know how to express the thing that I think about them."

There is something in this attitude of mind, at once so genial and so ready to receive fresh impressions, that is to us very touching and beautiful. It is in this that genius is child-like.

The Low Country artists treated Dürer very differently from their brethren of the South. Within a few days after his arrival—

"The painters," he says, "invited me to their chamber, with my wife and maid, and everything there was of silver and other costly ornamentation, and extremely costly viands. There were also all their wives there, and when I was conducted to the table all the people stood up on each side as if I had been a great lord. There were amongst them also many persons of distinction, who all bowed low, and in the most humble manner testified their pleasure at seeing me, and they said they would do all in their power to give me pleasure; and as I sat at table there came in the messenger of the Rath of Antwerp, who presented me with four tankards of wine in the name of the *Raths-herrn* (town-councillors), and he said that they desired to honour me with this, and that I should have their good-will. Then I said that I gave them my humble thanks, and offered them my humble service. After that came Meister Peter, the town carpenter, and presented me with two tankards of wine, with the expression of his willing service. And for a long time we were very merry together until quite late in the night; then they accompanied us home with torches in the most honourable manner, and they begged me to accept their good-will, and said they would do whatever I desired that might be of assistance to me. Then I thanked them, and went to bed. Also I have been to Meister Quintine's house."*

Nor was this only a transitory display of enthusiasm. Wherever he went he was received with honour by the men of his own craft. At Brussels, he says, Bernard Van Orlay, Court painter to the Regent Margaret, "invited me, and gave me such a costly meal, that I do not believe it could be paid for with ten florins." Nor was the company, which appears to have included Erasmus, unworthy of the feast. "Master Lucas," "a little man," "born at Leyden," "who engraves on copper," also entertained him hospitably. The two great engravers seem to have exchanged works. Both at Bruges and at Ghent the painters made much of him, and took him

* Meister Quintine was Quentin Matsys, the blacksmith painter.

round in triumph to see the great works of the Van Eycks, of Memling, and of Roger Van der Weyden the Elder, in those cities.

In the Netherlands, however, as before in Venice, it was not all sunshine, and several of the entries in the journal are very rueful. Thus he tells us how, "on St. Martin's Day, at Antwerp, in the cathedral, my wife had her purse cut; there were two florins in it. And the purse itself, and what more was in it, was also worth another florin, and there were some keys in it." So also he says, "I have again and again done sketches and many other things in the service of different persons, and for the most part of my work I have received nothing at all." Even the entry which records the success of his endeavours to obtain a ratification of the pension, and payment of the sums due by the late Emperor, is not altogether joyous. It runs thus:—"On the Monday after Martinmas (November 4th), 1520, I obtained my *Confirmatia* from the Emperor through my Lords of Nuremberg, *with great trouble and labour*." But the most pitiful memorandum of all, made nearly at the end of the journal, when Dürer was about to return to Nuremberg, apparently not much richer than when he started, is the following:—"In all my transactions in the Netherlands with people both of high and low degree, and in all my doings, expenses, sales, and other trafficking, I have always had the disadvantage; and particularly the Lady Margaret for all that I have given her, and done for her, has given me nothing in return."

If Dürer's worldly affairs had not prospered, it seems, however, possible that during his stay in the Netherlands he had found a pearl of great price. In one place he mentions, "I have bought a tract of Luther's for five white pfenning, moreover, one pfenning for the condemnation of Luther, the pious man." And though there is a subsequent record of a payment made to a confessor, yet it is evident from the following noble burst of eloquence that the doctrines of the Reformation, so new, and yet so old, had found some entrance into his heart. The passage, as will immediately be perceived, relates to Luther's abduction when on his way back from the Diet of Worms, and to his imprisonment in the Castle of Wartburg—of which the translation of the New Testament was to be the fruit.

Dürer was not, of course, aware, any more than his contemporaries, that this abduction had been carried out by Frederick Elector of Saxony in Luther's interest. He begins:—

"Item : On the Friday before Whitsuntide, in the year 1521, the report reached me at Antwerp that Martin Luther had been treacherously taken prisoner, for the herald of the Emperor Charles, to whose care he was committed under the Imperial safe-conduct, on arriving at an unfriendly place near Eisenach, rode off, saying that he dared stay no longer with him. Immediately ten horsemen appeared, who treacherously carried off the pious man sold into their hands. He was a man enlightened by the Holy Ghost, and a follower of the true Christian faith. Whether he lives still, or whether his enemies have murdered him, I know not; but he has suffered much for Christ's truth, and because he has rebuked the unchristian Papacy which strives against the freedom of Christ, with its heavy burdens of human laws, and for this we are robbed of the price of our blood and sweat, that it may be expended shamefully by idle, lascivious people, whilst thirsty and sick men perish of hunger; and, above all, this is most grievous to me, that God will perhaps suffer us to remain under their false, blind teaching, which the men, whom they call the Fathers, have invented and set down, whereby the precious Word is in many places falsely explained, or not set forth at all.

"O God of heaven, have mercy on us! O Lord Jesus Christ, pray for Thy people, redeem us in Thy right time, keep us in the true Christian faith, collect Thy far-separated sheep by Thy voice, heard in Thy Holy Word; help us to recognise Thy voice, so that we may not follow any device of man's invention. And, in order that we may not turn away from Thee, Lord Jesus Christ, call together again the sheep of Thy fold, of whom part are still to be found in the Roman Church, with others amongst the Indians, Muscovites, Russians, and Greeks, who, through the burdens and avarice of the Papacy, have been separated from us. O God, redeem Thy poor people who are constrained by means of great torments to follow men's ordinances, none of which they would willingly observe, and thus constantly sin against their consciences by embracing them! Never were any people so horribly burdened with ordinances as us poor people by the Romish See; we who, redeemed by Thy blood, ought to be free Christians.

"O Almighty, heavenly Father, pour into our hearts, through Thy Son Jesus Christ, such light that we may recognise that messenger whom we ought to obey, so that we may put aside the burdens of the others with a safe conscience, and serve Thee, the eternal Father, with happy, joyful hearts; and in place of this man, who has written clearer than any other has done for one hundred and forty years, and to whom Thou hast given such a large amount of Thy Holy Spirit, we pray Thee, O heavenly Father, that Thou wilt again give Thy Holy Spirit to one who will assemble Thy Christian Church from all parts of the world, so that we may live again in a Christian manner; and that Turks, heathens, and Hindoos, and all unbelievers, seeing our good works, may be converted, and accept the Christian faith. But, Lord, remember ere Thou judgest how Thy Son Jesus Christ was made to suffer death of the priests, and rose again from the dead, and after-

wards ascended into heaven ; and this fate has also in like manner overtaken Thy follower, Martin Luther, whom the Pope treacherously betrayed and took away his life, whom Thou wilt quicken. And as, after my Lord was crucified, Jerusalem was destroyed, so wilt Thou now, after this one has been taken, destroy the power of the Papal Chair. O Lord, give unto us that New Jerusalem that shall come down from heaven, whereof the Apocalypse writes ; the holy clear Gospel that is not darkened by human doctrine. This may every one see who reads Martin Luther's books, how his teaching sets forth clearly and transparently the holy Gospels ; therefore, his books are to be held in much honour, and not to be burnt. It would be better, indeed, to cast his adversaries into the fire, with all their opinions, who would make gods of men, and always oppose the truth.

"O God, is Luther dead? Who will henceforth explain to us so clearly the holy Gospel? Alas! what might he not still have written for us during the next ten or twenty years? O all pious Christian men, bewail with me this God-inspired man, and pray to God to send us another enlightened teacher! O Erasmus of Rotterdam, where dost thou remain? Behold how the unjust tyranny of this world's might and the powers of darkness prevail! Hear, thou knight of Christ; ride forth in the name of the Lord, defend the truth, attain the martyr's crown; thou art already an old man, and I have heard thee say that thou givest thyself only two years longer in which thou wilt still be fit for work. Employ these well, then, in the cause of the Gospel, and the true Christian faith. Lift up thy voice, and so shall not the gates of hell (the See of Rome), as Christ saith, prevail against thee. And although, like thy Master Christ, thou hast to suffer shame on earth, and even die a short time sooner than thou otherwise mightest, yet wilt thou pass the sooner from death unto life, and be glorified through Christ. For if thou drinkest of the cup which He drank, so wilt thou reign with Him, and judge justly those who have not acted righteously. O Erasmus, hold to this, and put thy boast in the Lord, as it stands written in David, for thou canst do this, and in truth thou mayest prevail to fell this Goliath; for God will uphold His holy Christian Church according to His Divine will. May He give us eternal bliss, who is God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, one eternal God. Amen.

"Oh, all ye Christian men, pray to God for help, for His judgment draws nigh, and His righteousness shall be made plain. Then we shall see the blood of the innocent, which popes, bishops, and monks have spilt, rise up in judgment, and condemn them. And these are the souls of the slain that lie under the altar of God, and cry for vengeance, to which the voice of God replies, 'Fill up the measure of the innocent who are slain, then will I judge.'"

But Erasmus, the witty worldling, the elegant scholar and man of culture, had no thought of answering to this or any similar appeal, however stirring. "I am not of a mind," he said, "to venture my life for the truth's sake; all men have

not strength to endure the martyr's death. For myself, if it came to the point, I should do no better than Simon Peter." Indeed, from the constitution of his mind, he entertained but little sympathy for the rough, strong work that had to be done at the commencement of the Reformation. Dürer began painting his portrait at Brussels, and possibly the philosopher's lukewarmness in the good cause may have been the reason why it was never finished. For, in a letter to Pirkheimer, Erasmus says, "Dürer began to paint me at Brussels, and it is to be wished that he had accomplished a painting, but from trivial causes we were not at that time very well agreed." The engraved portrait was executed after Dürer's return to Nuremberg, from a sketch taken in the Netherlands. It is that of an old man standing at a desk. Humour and learning are written in every wrinkle of the face. Two or three folios and a vase of flowers—lilies of the valley apparently—are on the table at his side. This portrait raises a very curious question, for it is unlike those drawn very shortly afterwards by Holbein, all very similar, and of one of which Erasmus wrote to Sir Thomas More that "it was much more like him than the one by the famous Albert Dürer." And so again, he wrote to a friend in 1528, "Dürer painted me a few years ago, but not at all like." Arguing from this, Mr. Wornum, in his *Life of Holbein*, is "strongly induced to doubt Albert Dürer's power of seeing what was before him." This is a hard saying—for if an artist] have not this power, what is the value of his art?—but the evidence in its favour is too strong to be set aside contemptuously. For though Erasmus may not have liked Dürer,* and certainly did like Holbein, and wished to befriend him in his correspondence with More, and though also many persons are not good judges of their own likenesses, yet his testimony must go for something. We have nothing to check it by but the relative verisimilitude of the portraits by the two men, the appearance which their works present, that they did—

" After poring on a face,
Divinely through all hindrance find the man
Behind it, and so paint him that his face,
The shape and colour of a mind and life,
Lives for his children, ever at its best
And fullest."

* These are his words on hearing of Dürer's death :—"What is the use of mourning over Dürer's death? Are we not all mortal? I have prepared an epitaph for him in my little book."

And in the gift of embodiment Holbein is unsurpassed. Perhaps the judgment on his own art, which Dürer in the latter years of his life expressed to Melanchthon, may help us to understand how he might suffer in such a comparison.

"I remember," says Melanchthon, "that Albert Dürer the painter, a man excelling in talent as in virtue, used to say that when a youth he liked bright and varied composition, and that he could not but rejoice in his own works when he saw them again. But that after he attained to mature years, and could see better, and more truly understood the significance of the face of nature, he knew that simplicity was the greatest glory of art. However, as he could not altogether attain to that simplicity, he said he no longer admired his own works as he formerly did, but rather groaned and lamented over his early pictures, thinking of his own weakness."

Applying this most interesting criticism to portraiture, we should gather—and this is amply confirmed by his works—that what Dürer set himself to paint in any face was what we may term its picturesqueness and complexity. Beauty, for him, did not lie, as it does for most artists, in regularity of feature, sweetness of expression, and purity of complexion. It lay in character, in the thousand marks which thought, or time, or passion, or the accidents of life grave upon the countenance, making it sometimes, indeed, "a human face divine," a witness of high communion with God, and sometimes a tell-tale record of baseness and impurity. And as for some painters, the allurements of what is usually regarded as beauty prove too strong, and they pay their sitters the poor compliment of flattery, so Dürer may have been led to exaggerate the marks and lines he loved so well, thus erring from truth on the other side and falling also into what, from his point of view, was flattery. Holbein more nearly hit the mean between the two extremes, and was a very great artist besides. Still it is hard to compare an engraving from a hasty sketch with a finished painting. The portraits of Melanchthon would furnish a more just term of comparison. But, unfortunately, it is very doubtful whether the drawing of the beautifully sweet and refined head in the Holbein collection at Windsor—a head which we should be glad to associate in our thoughts with the gentle Reformer—is really a portrait of Melanchthon, though it bears his name.

In the autumn of 1521, Dürer returned to his native town, which was now strongly impregnated with the new heresy. How far he openly sided with the Reformers is unknown. But we do know what were his feelings prior to this; and when, in 1526, Melanchthon established a Protestant school

in Nuremberg, the scholar and the artist lived in a daily and loving intercourse, which implies, at least, some harmony of view. As Mrs. Heaton says, "It is pleasant to think of Dürer's last years being cheered and upheld by such a friendship as this." Those last years were spent in work. He wrought at his engravings, put forth his whole strength in the two large life-size panel paintings of Saints Peter and John, Saints Mark and Paul, which he presented to the city. He wrote three treatises, one on Geometry, one on Fortification, and another, not published till after his death, on Human Proportion. And so, his labours being ended, but not their influence, he died on the 6th of April, 1528, at the age of fifty-seven. "I grieve," said Melancthon, when sorrowfully compelled to believe that the news was true, "I grieve for Germany, deprived of such a man and such an artist." . . . "His art, great as it was, was his least merit."

There is one aspect in which the career of Albert Dürer seems to us to possess great significance, especially at the present time. We do not now allude to his readiness to undertake any work, however apparently inferior—such as designing a goldsmith's cup, or a coat-of-arms, or a pattern for lace—though the example might not be without its lesson for those who prate of the dignity of art, and despise, forsooth, even the painting of portraits. We wish to say a word now respecting that school whose cant word is *Philistinism*, and who regard everything English, all that relates to the life of England, as unworthy of art, and would call upon our writers to imitate the literature of other lands, and upon our artists to pursue foreign methods, and to imbue themselves with the spirit of different times or countries. Now, let us look at Dürer in this matter. A German burgher, the citizen of a busy commercial town, he loved the place in which he was born, and accepted unhesitatingly the influences that surrounded him there. Even the art of Venice at its zenith was powerless to lead him from his German habits of thought, and German practice. Had it been otherwise, had he suffered himself to be carried away by the example of Titian and Giorgione and Bellini, had he eclectically sought to imitate what was best in their work—why, the world would have had one great German painter the less, and have gained but a very indifferent Italian painter in exchange. His art was great because it was thoroughly national, because it was the natural outgrowth of his own genius, race, and time. Let us not be misunderstood. Far be it from us, as Englishmen, to refuse the highest honour to foreign literature and foreign

art. Both have achieved many things that we have not achieved, and—for this is the point—shall never achieve. In so far as we refuse to acknowledge their excellence we are bad critics, and injure ourselves only. But it is foolish to argue from this that we should despise what is characteristic of our own national genius, and do our clumsy best to imitate what others can do very much better. The world of art is wide; in a civilisation so varied as our own, it will always happen that there are men whose thoughts flow naturally in a foreign channel. Let them follow their bent, not arrogating to themselves, however, any superiority over their fellows. But, as regards the immense majority of artists, they will only do anything permanent or great by embodying the thoughts and the spirit—though not by any means necessarily the scenes—of their own land and line. If they cannot do that without vulgarity, it is useless for them to seek after an exotic refinement.

ART. IV.—1. *The History of the Norman Conquest of England, its Causes and its Results.* By EDWARD A. FREEMAN, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College. Vol. I., 1867; Vol. II., 1868; Vol. III., 1870. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press.

2. *Histoire des Ducs de Normandie.* Par M. LA BUTTE. Préface par Henri Martin. Paris, 1852.

THERE is, perhaps, no one year of English history, nor indeed of any history, which has so much literature of its own as this year of the Norman Conquest. And (as Mr. Freeman reminds us) there is no one year, at any rate since A.D. 1000, in which such important issues were decided. No day, in fact, will at all compare with the day of Senlac, except that which saw the first English land at Ebb's Fleet in their three "keels," and that other great day when, in the same little Kentish harbour, Augustine first set foot on English soil.

Its paramount importance, however, must not lead us to think of the Conquest as the beginning of English history, and of all before it as like those "battles of kites and crows" of which Milton spoke so contemptuously. Rather, in Mr. Freeman's words, there began at the Conquest a temporary decline of our national being, which gradually sank till it reached its lowest under the Angevin Richard I.; and after the long struggle of Henry III.'s reign, recovered itself under the First Edward, "the first English king since Harold." And, once revived, the old national life was found to have gained strength during its time of trial. New blood had been infused into England's veins: the Normans had become Englishmen. "William came seemingly to undo the Teuton work, but he came really to win the Normans back to the Teuton fold, to wash them from the Roman tinge which had stained them during their sojourn in Gaul" (Freeman, iii., 403). On this point—the continuity of English life, unaffected by the break of some two hundred years—Mr. Freeman is very strong; he insists on it again and again. He notes the striking analogy between Edward I. and Edward the Elder son of Alfred, "the Unconquered," as he was styled, who first asserted England's supremacy over Wales and Scotland. He grows quite pathetic about Harold's second burial at Waltham, where "the greatest of the Plantagenets" lay for awhile side by side with him—till men had leisure to bury him ("donec vacaret eis intendere

sepultura," as Walter of Hemingford has it): "in the whole course of English history we hardly come across a scene which speaks more deeply to the heart than when the first founder of our later greatness was laid by the side of the last kingly champion of our earliest freedom." Another strong point with Mr. Freeman is the need for the historian of the Conquest of not limiting his view to the years near 1066, or to the realm of England only: speaking of Duke William, and by way of apology for the long chapters which he devotes to purely Norman history, he says, "All that concerns him, all that had any share in making him what he was, belongs to my subject." Connected with this is his endorsement of the remark, so often made, that the Conquest really began in Edward the Confessor's, if not in Ethelred's time. Thus we see that his subject is very much wider than his title; his plan embraces five volumes, the first preliminary, going back to the first settlement of the English people (he would fain go back, as, indeed, he says we can trace back their institutions, to the primitive Aryan stock); the next devoted to the Confessor's reign; the third, of 768 pages, taken up with the events of the momentous year of the Conquest; the next detailing William's rule in England; and the last, supplementary, giving a sketch of our history up to the accession of Edward I. Though incomplete, his work has reached such a stage that we are well able to form an estimate of it. And, much as history-writing has changed since the days when Hume called Lanfranc of Pavia a monk of Milan, and said the Bayeux tapestry was preserved in the ducal palace at Rouen, there has seldom been produced a work of such minute research—so every way exhaustive—as Mr. Freeman's. It was the French who set the fashion of this kind of writing, at once elaborate and picturesque, which is to history what pre-Raffaellism is to painting; but Mr. Freeman has here applied to a long period that painstaking method which our neighbours are usually content to limit to a brief monograph. He has read all that is to be read; and is as much at home among Saxon chronicles, and Norse sagas, and old French romances, as most historians are among mere second-hand authorities. The subject in its widest sense has, as we said, been the theme of a great deal of writing. Sharon Turner will still be in the memories of some of us; then there is Thierry, who errs in exaggerating the length of time during which the two races, Norman and English, stood apart; then Sir F. Palgrave, who holds just the opposite view, and would have us believe that the Conquest was nothing but a mere change of dynasty; then

Lord Lytton, whose very accurate novel is a protest against such falsifying of history as we find in *Ivanhoe* and *Woodstock* ;* then John Kemble, the man who did more than any one else to fix our notions about our English forefathers, and to give us facts instead of vague assertion—the man, too, who introduced us to the archæologists of Northern Europe ; then those archæologists themselves—Lappenberg and Worsae pre-eminent among them ; then Mr. Wright, with his *Celt Roman and Saxon* ; then Mr. Pearson, with whom our author has but little sympathy ; then a host of French monographs, one of the best of which is that of M. La Butte ; and lastly, Mr. Kingsley's *Hereward*, in which the ex-Professor succeeds, as usual, in making his pets so unlovely that, for the first time in our lives, we begin to look on the Conquest as the best thing that could have happened to them. But among all this company there was still room for Mr. Freeman. No one thinks Mr. Grote's work unnecessary because Bishop Thirlwall's preceded it ; and our author aims at giving, as Mr. Grote does, photographs of the chief personages of the time—so that we may rise from his book with a truer notion of what sort of man Canute was, and Godwin, and Brithnoth of Maldon, and Archbishop Aldred, and the rest. And Mr. Freeman's portraits are like photographs, in that they are the result not of broad masses of colour, but of a multiplicity of details ; and they are like good photographs in that they do not distract the attention with many accessories. He leaves the antiquarian business for others ; he shows at every turn that he knows all about it ; but, except for a few pages in the account of William's preparations at the mouth of the Dive, he seldom talks of how men dressed, or what they ate, or how they got from place to place. We see that he is well up in all this kind of lore ; but about the dignity of history he seems to think like Thucydides, and to hold such minutiae almost too cheap. On the other hand, his painstaking with regard to local features is immense. He has been over the whole ground of Harold's northern campaign ; and at Senlac he knows every little hollow, every trace of a marsh or a ditch. What a difference there is, in this respect, between the old and the new school of historians ! Compare, for instance, Dr. Arnold's careful study of the battlefields of old Italy with the offhand way

* Those who have not lately read *Harold* will do well to compare it with Mr. Freeman's book. They will be struck with the many resemblances, which show how closely the novelist has adhered to the original records ; and they will admire the insight which looks so clearly into the causes of things—which sees, for instance, that England was weak because the Church was corrupt, and because gold had become the chief power in the State.

in which men used either to leave out details altogether, or to take everything at second or third hand. One of Mr. Freeman's peculiarities is his reticence; his work impresses you throughout with a sense of suppressed power. You feel that he could, if he pleased, run on through page after page about this man's character and that man's influence on his times; but he prefers the plan of writing history in enthymemes, leaving his reader to do what historians are generally so fond of doing, and contenting himself with broadly enunciating his views, and not breaking his narrative with a multitude of "reflections." His dissertations on most points he banishes to appendices, which make up no inconsiderable part of the work (200 pages in vol. iii.), and which are always interesting both from their matter, and from the ingenious way in which they are reasoned out. The date of the Bayeux tapestry, which Mr. Freeman thinks was made by English needlewomen for Bishop Odo of Bayeux, the Conqueror's half-brother, is discussed in an admirable way. It will be news to most of us that this remarkable work (to which our author appeals again and again to decide moot points) is first noticed in a paper written by M. Lancelot in 1724, and published in the *Memoirs of the French Academy* in 1729. A copy of some portion of the figures had been found among the papers of Foucault, "intendant" of Normandy; and this M. Lancelot describes without knowing of what work it formed a part. Of course Montfaucon has it, as what is there which he has not? And this diligent antiquary rightly guessed that it was tapestry, and traced it to Bayeux Cathedral; this was in 1730. At the revolution it narrowly escaped being cut to pieces to adorn a civic car; and it was actually taken to Paris by the First Consul to be exhibited in order to stir up the Parisians to another conquest of England. "Edward's Bequest of the Crown to Harold;" "Harold's Election;" his "Coronation;" his "Coinage," in which PAX is the motto on the obverse—as though he longed for what was denied to him more completely than to any king; "Harold's Oath;"—these are the subjects of a few of Mr. Freeman's appendices. The titles which we have quoted remind us of what is, after all, the purpose of the book—the glorification of Harold, son of Godwin, the model Englishman "in whom (says Lord Lytton) beat the heart of England."

Mr. Freeman is, above all things, an Englishman. He makes somewhat light (too light, many will think) of Godwin's share in the murder of Alfred, brother of the Confessor, because, by his strong English feeling, and his unflinching opposition to the Confessor's Normanising ways, Godwin

amply atoned, he thinks, for all his shortcomings. But for Harold he has little else but praise from one end of his career to the other. No one in Western Europe is worthy to compare with him. He says, in one of the very few passages in which he rises into enthusiasm :—

“One prince alone, in the later history of Europe, rivals the peculiar glory which attaches to the name of Harold. For him we must seek in a distant age, and in a distant land, but in a land connected with our own by a strangely abiding tie. English warriors, soldiers of Harold chafing under the yoke of the Norman conqueror, sought service at the court of the Eastern Cæsar, and there retained for ages their national tongue, their national weapon, and the proud inheritance of their stainless loyalty. The memory of England and of Harold becomes thus strangely interwoven with the memory of the one prince of later times who fell in the breach against a foreign foe, and he who died upon the hill of Senlac finds his only worthy peer in the Emperor who died before the gate of St. Romanos. The champion of England against the Southern invader must own a nobler martyr still in the champion of the faith and liberty of Christendom against the misbelieving horde who have ever since defiled the fairest and most historic regions of the world. The blood of Harold and his faithful followers has, indeed, proved the most fertile seed of English freedom, and the warning signs of the times seem to tell us that the day is fast coming when the blood of Constantine shall no longer send up its cry for vengeance unheeded from the earth.”—Vol. ii., pp. 43-4.

In the eyes of Harold's apologist even the wild fray at Porlock is but an ordinary episode in a wild age; the wonder is that the man who then harried his king's subjects should have felt such contrition that, on the eve of Hastings, when Gurth urged him to lay waste the land, and starve out the enemy, he should have replied, “I've done burnings enough; not even an English barn will I ever again cause to be set on fire.” Nor will Mr. Freeman believe the often-repeated charge of parsimony, which is said to have caused the large falling off in Harold's men after Stamford-bridge; and as for the tale that, when Gurth advised craft in dealing with the Normans, and begged his brother to send him instead of adventuring himself, Harold thrust him away with insult, and spurned from him his mother, still sad at the fate of Tostig, who had implored him not to peril the lives of all her remaining sons, our author looks on it as “coined in the same mint of falsehood as the tales which describe William as striking Matilda with his spur, or beating her to death with his bridle.” As to Harold's behaviour at that time, we cannot tell; but for the quarrels in later life of William and his queen, there is the abiding tradition of the

pleureuse at Caen. The tales about the boyish jealousy of Harold and Tostig, we see no reason for disbelieving. Godwin's house fell because it was divided against itself; and it is hard to believe that such an eloquent peacemaker as Harold could not have won Tostig over, had there not been some rankling ill-feeling which prevented him from trying his best to move him. Of Sweyn Mr. Freeman tells us just enough to make us wish for more. The Reuben of Godwin's house has always seemed to us rather hardly dealt with; he slew his cousin Biorn, but then his father had compassed the death of the younger Alfred; and his relations with the Abbess of Leominster were only ecclesiastically more reprehensible than those of Harold with Edith of the Swan's-neck. The rise of the house of Godwin, thorough Englishman though Godwin was, was undoubtedly the downfall of England. That house seemed to fill the land, and the other great Englishmen of the time felt as if there was no room for them in their own country; that is why they were half-hearted in the struggle. To men like Edwin and Morcar, who thought of William as of another Canute—a king who would become English, and would force his Normans to become English too, it seemed that they could not be worse off, but would probably be better, under the Norman duke than under the Earl of West Saxons. Godwin's self-seeking found its reward; all his children, except Wolfnoth, the hostage at the Norman Court, filled high places in England—all, for Sweyn had a piece of Western Mercia carved into an earldom for him. His second son was undoubtedly named his successor by Edward, and chosen by the witan of the English people; but the love which hailed the family on their return from exile seems to have waxed cold; and when we find Northumberland and Mercia declining to join in the march against William, we are at once reminded that Harold would have done immeasurably better for the nation and for himself had he accepted instead of the kingdom the office of protector to the Atheling, whom he might surely have educated into a prince of fair English feeling. No doubt Harold's conduct was exceedingly natural; and he suffers not so much for his own faults as for those of his father and his brother Tostig. Still, even in an age when the hereditary principle was weak, the cause of England suffered from its being so wholly put aside. But other reasons beside half-heartedness in the cause of the Godwin family made England weak; it must have been weak when so little resistance was made to an enemy who could hardly have stood his ground against a winter of guerilla warfare. The most patent

cause was that on which Mr. Freeman insists again and again—Edward's wholesale importations of Normans, lay and cleric; though Ralph, the archbishop, in whom, according to the chronicler, the king had such faith that "if he had said a black crow was white he would rather have trusted his words than his own eyes," had not reappeared, after his sudden flight, when Godwin came back from exile; nor had Ulf, the bad Bishop of Dorchester. But William, the Norman, was Bishop of London, already the heart of the kingdom, and Ralph the Timid, and others of the same race, held lands all over the country. Another cause was the want of national feeling. What is constantly reproached against the Celts would seem far truer of the Teuton English, before they were welded together during the two centuries of Norman and Angevin rule. Even the pressure of Danish invasion could not force them into unity; and though the Danish conquest (for such it was of more than half the island) was effected by a kindred people, Danes and English had not coalesced. The five burghs (Stamford, Leicester, Derby, Nottingham, and Lincoln) were still un-English; nor was it the jealousy of Edwin and Morcar only which made Mercia and Northumbria chafe under the supremacy of Wessex. Then there was the great social change which had converted hereditary rank into a mere nobility of office—Godwin, the able statesman, and Edric, the traitor, were alike men of humble origin. Godwin, the story runs, was the son of a yeoman, in whose house Canute rested after one of his battles with Edmund. The Witan, still theoretically a meeting of all freemen, had come to be something not very different from the Great Council of the Norman kings. The Church, too, had been growing corrupt. Roman influence certainly tended in those days, on the whole, to keep off gross scandals. No doubt the boast that the Saxon Church was, in some points, more "national" than that of Norman times is, in one sense, well-grounded. But the old Scotie Church of Ireland, with its hereditary preferment, and its scores of bishops, kept (like ecclesiastical queen-bees) for purposes of ordination, was strictly national; so was the Pictish Church, in which, to the hereditary preferment of the Scots, was added a close system of lay-impropriation; and, in more modern times, "nationality" has not always sufficed to keep a church from corruption. Roman rule brought many evils. Mr. Freeman, in acknowledging the immense value of the support which William received, through Archdeacon Hildebrand, from Alexander II., hints at the terrible price at which he purchased it. The evils were

many and great. The troubles of the Tudor period, the state of Ireland now, and much more, might be traced to this source. But the Saxon clergy invited the aggression. Wolfstan excepted, there was not one good bishop among them. Man for man, Lanfranc (not to speak of holy Anselm) was a far more estimable character than grasping, worldly Stigand, who was the only man at Edward's death-bed unmoved by the solemn scene, and capable of treating the king's dying words as the "maunderings of a sick man." It was an age of pluralities, ecclesiastical as well as civil. Men added earldom to earldom, and bishops joined see to see. Aldred held three together; and to be abbot of some large monastery was a rule among the bishops of the time. The Church was said to hold a third of the soil of England; and it is a point in Godwin's favour that he is charged, on all hands, with not having done, what every one did then,—endow some religious house for the good of his soul. His son's great foundation at Waltham, in honour of the fragment of the true cross discovered in Epping Forest (hence Harold's rallying cry, "holy rood"), is explained by Mr. Freeman as a reaction against monkery. Harold's Waltham priests were "*secular*" canons, some of them (according to Saxon use) married; all free to leave when they pleased. Their house was (our author tells us) intended to be a great educational centre, where learned Lorrainers (to which nation the Godwin family were very partial) and others might be invited. A great point is made of the contrast between it and Edward's purely monkish house of the New- or West-minster.

It is certain that there was a decay, intellectually as well as spiritually, among the clergy of England, such as not seldom results from the growth of luxury and wealth. For England had been growing rich, despite the Danish and other troubles. Even in Ethelred's time the danegelt proved, by its enormous amount, the wealth of the country. The plunder of so rich a land is set before his followers as a motive by William: strangely enough he, the crusader, who came with the Pope's blessing, and the blessed banner, and the ring with St. Peter's hair, condescends to such a motive; and adds, *in proof of his being in the right*, that Harold had not dared to grant away any of his (William's) possessions, while he, bold in a good cause, was distributing the English king's property by anticipation. We all know, moreover, how William dazzled the eyes of his courtiers at Rouen, when he first went over after his coronation, by a display of English gold and silver plate and jewels. This wealth was not, after

the Franco-Norman fashion, spent in lasting works of secular or religious architecture. We hear indeed of Wilfred's stained glass windows brought from Rome for York; but architecture among the English never made a fair start. Conisborough Castle may be in part "Saxon," as Barnack, and one or two other church towers, built in the "long and short" manner, unquestionably are; but beyond these—scantier even than the still existing Roman remains—we have no "Saxon" building. A great deal of the wealth which had been accumulated, and the fame of which made London already a famous commercial centre, was lavished on coarse pleasures. William of Malmesbury is somewhat Norman in feeling; but he is probably not exaggerating much when he stigmatises the English as too much given to eating and drinking. We need not inquire whether he is right or not in adding, "The vices which accompany intemperance and which weaken men's minds likewise came upon them. Hence it was, that meeting William rather with rashness and headlong fury than with military skill they ruined their country, and gave themselves over to slavery after a single battle and that not a very hard-fought one." (iii. 245.) Senlac, lasting from sunrise to sunset, and even after—for the slaughter in *Malfosse*, when the flying English turned, and so fiercely revenged themselves on their foes that William was in danger, and Eustace of Boulogne counselled him to fly, took place after dusk—was surely a hard-fought fight. The evil was that the national wealth was too unevenly distributed: as Mr. Freeman hints, the Ceorl, once as proud of his freedom as the Earl, seems to have been gradually depressed in social position; nay, the class of yeomen (ceorls, small freeholders) greatly diminished during the interval between 827 and 1066, the thrall (servile) class, doubtless, being proportionally increased. This must almost inevitably be the result of protracted home-wars: the Danish wars produced the same effect in England which the wars of the Commonwealth had produced in Rome. The tendency in England, as in Italy, came to be towards two classes, poor and very rich, and such a division of society is always dangerous. On the whole, it would appear as if this England, for the purely Teutonic character of which Mr. Freeman vouches so strongly, was not exactly a success in the middle of the eleventh century. York surrendered in four days to Harold Hardrada, and Tostig, after the slaughter, to Fulford; just as Dover and Canterbury opened their gates to William after Senlac. Sixty years had not improved the national spirit; the six great battles which Edmund Ironside fought

in seven months stand alone. They were national conflicts; Stamford-bridge and Senlac were fought mainly by Harold's *comitatus*, or personal following, and his house-carles, the standing army which the English kings had been increasing ever since Ethelred's time. It was a bad sign that the *earl* should disappear and be succeeded by the *thane* (the *gn*, from the *gnan*, *dienen*, *to serve*), the servant of the king, whose nobility was one of office: it was a bad sign when the *folkland* (the *ager publicus*) gradually became king's land (*ager regis*), and was dealt with accordingly. The evil was mainly due to the Norse invasions, to which, in our persistent optimism, we attribute some occult good, but which certainly did a vast amount of harm to all North-Western Europe. They broke up the "egg-shell civilisation" of the Irish septs, so theoretically perfect in the old Brehon, and paved the way for the easy occupation of that island by its neighbours; and in England they so weakened the polity to which Alfred had put the finishing touch, and which had stood so well, through Edward and Æthelstan, that they prepared an easy triumph for the Normans. The imperial Teuton race could no more thrive in the face of such constant assaults than those whom we stigmatise as poor Celts. But is Mr. Freeman right in making his English out to be such pure-blood Teutons? That they are so is even more an article of faith with him than that Harold was a peerless king. Most of us know how he has treated the subject in his three lectures published in *Macmillan*, the gist of which is, that the "Saxons," as we used to call them, were such blood-thirsty invaders that they utterly destroyed the whole of the inhabitants of those parts which they occupied while they were heathen. The existence of "the Welsh kind," west of the Somersetshire Axe, *i.e.*, of the Mendip frontier, and the fact that Æthelstan found Briton and Englishman living side-by-side, *æquâ lege*, in Exeter, he accounts for by reminding us that the men who pushed Wessex beyond the Axe were no longer heathen but Christian. Now, entire extermination is, unhappily, possible: Tasmania at once proves this, and the fact is certainly not a credit to "Anglo-Saxon" dealings with "subject races." Further, the Saxon Chronicle itself tells us of partial "clearings" during the invasion. When Ælla, for instance, and Cissa landed by Andredesceaster (Pevensey), "they slew all that was therein; nor was there a Briton left there any more." "Dreadful in its simplicity," Gibbon might well call this passage: and similar scenes were enacted in other *ceasters*. But the very fact that these are exceptionally named shows that the slaughter else-

where was not so wholesale. Cromwell killed all the souls in several Irish castles; but that does not prove that he destroyed the whole population of Munster. Though he did, indeed, profess to deal with them as Joshua did with the Canaanites, and though he actually banished almost every family of condition beyond the Shannon, the peasantry, in part at least, remained; and Tipperary, after all, though less Celtic than most of Ireland, is certainly more Irish than English. The Saxon English did their work more thoroughly than the Cromwellians—they took longer about it; but still we hold with Mr. Kemble, that “the mass of the people, accustomed to Roman rule or to native oppression, suffered little by the change of masters, and did little to avoid it.” The question of language is one on which Messrs. Pike and Nicolas have lately had a good deal to say. We are not at all prepared to affirm what difference there is in style between *Beowulf*, written possibly before the English came to Britain, and the works which they did write here, or how far that difference was due to Romano-British influence. Even Mr. Freeman does not hold that all the British women were massacred or driven out; and by them the blood, if not the speech, of the next generation must have been modified. Language we hold to be always a poor test of race-changes. Some races (the Norse, for instance) have a singular facility for losing theirs and adopting that of their subjects. Others, like the Teuton and the old Roman, take their speech with them. Almost all through England we hold there is a substratum of what most people call Celtic (Mr. Huxley, who holds Celt and Teuton to be much the same, might call it Euskarian) blood: will anyone say, for instance, that the brown-faced, black-haired, dark-eyed Dorset folk are “Saxons”? Yet Dorset, with its famous Wessex towns, was just as English in Alfred’s day as its neighbour, Wiltshire, where the skins are generally light, and the eyes are of the orthodox grey.

Neither can we agree with Mr. Freeman in his assertion that the Roman influence on Britain was merely superficial. No doubt the “Saxon” lost a great deal; he often deserted the Roman towns for fear of the enchantment which he believed would have power over him in their neighbourhood; but he could not get rid of the Roman roads, or of many other evidences of culture. We have held India more than a century since Assaye, and sometimes it is said that if we left it we should leave no record of ourselves but bitter-beer bottle. The Romans had been masters of Britain four times as long as we have been masters of India; and at every

turn we meet proofs of how they had left their mark on the land. If, centuries afterwards, Giraldus Cambrensis saw the towers of Arthur's Caerleon still standing, we may be sure there were plenty of other remains left in Egbert's time; and we must have a very poor notion indeed of the "Saxons," and their intelligence, if we can imagine them living as unmoved amid such relics as the Bedouin lives among the ruins of Petra. But our municipal institutions bear in many points the Roman stamp; our guilds are (as has lately been shown to be the case with the Spanish guilds) the lineal descendants of the Roman craftsmen's *Collegia*. So that we may demur *in toto* to the assertion that "the Englishman made as clean a sweep in England as the Saracen did in Roman Africa."

But it would be very unfair in dealing with a work for which its author has (he tells us) been collecting materials for twenty years, not to give some sort of an analysis. To begin, then, with the first volume, which is headed (as well it may be) with the famous verse from Eccles. xlv., "Let us, therefore, praise mighty men, &c." Mr. Freeman insists, as we said, on the need for a knowledge of the previous history of England and of Normandy:—

"For Normandy the Conquest was one of a long series of conquests; for England it was the last act of what had been begun in Edgar's reign. The grand points for us to remember are, first, that while it is the turning-point of English history—a point of which it is impossible to exaggerate the real importance—it is not its beginning; and next, that in a few generations we led captive our conquerors. Simon de Montfort and Edward I. were step-children, indeed, but noble and worthy step-children of the old English stock. . . . It was less than a national migration but more than a change of dynasty. It happened at a transition period in the struggle between Roman and Teuton. England, which had been Teuton before, is now drawn into the group of Romance governments. It gave us a new nobility; but (wholly unlike the English Conquest of Ireland), it did not sweep away the old laws, though it opened the way for endless later changes in those laws themselves. Its immediate results were mainly practical; the formal legislative changes (in land tenure especially) were mostly of later date (made by Henry II.), and were but the natural result of altered circumstances. Even the change in our type of monarchy began before the Conquest; it was hastened by it, but not completed till long after. What the constitution was under Edgar it remained under William. Our map now, moreover, is the same as it was in William's time, while that of France has often changed, and that of Germany is still changing."

Mr. Freeman next gives, in perhaps his liveliest chapter,

an estimate of the Norman character. *Their settlement made Gaul France*; with that facile reciprocity of which we have spoken already, they soon became Romance-speaking French, and their doing so decided the struggle between Teutonic Laon and Romance Paris, giving the supremacy to the latter. On this Norman character Mr. Freeman waxes eloquent; they were the Saracens of Europe; they were prominent in devotion, yet careful to keep ecclesiastics in check.* In war they changed the whole tactics of Europe; in peace they invented nothing (like the Mahometans in this, and like the imperial race of whom Virgil said, "*Tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento*"); but they ransacked Europe for scholars, poets, theologians, philosophers; bringing, for instance, Lanfranc and Anselm from Lombardy to Bec, and forming there the most famous place of learning in Europe. Yet, as a race, the Normans have vanished. In Apulia, in Sicily, they are gone. Germany only knew them by the wonderful Frederic II., who was far more of a Norman than a Suabian; in their old Gallic home they are a quiet set of peasant farmers; in Canada (where there is a great deal of their blood) they are the quietest and most unenterprising of the inhabitants. Perhaps in Ireland, where, with their usual adaptability, they so soon became *Hibernis ipsis hiberniores*, they longest retained their old Norse characteristics; though these rather came out again, amid congenial lawlessness, after having been repressed, both on the Continent and in England. Whatever help oneness of blood (a very remote cousinship, by the way) may have been in furthering amalgamation between the conquerors and the conquered, and Mr. Freeman thinks it certainly was some help, we must not forget that William's subjects were not Northmen, but Normans. The difference is immeasurable between Rolf, with his *ne si by Gott*, and the founder of St. Stephen's at Caen; and the invaders, too, were far from being all Normans:—as was the case when the Tudor Richmond came over, many of them were Bretons, glad, no doubt, to gratify the old grudge against the "Saxon" (Harold, moreover, had, during his stay in Normandy, joined in an expedition against them). Alan, their count, seems to have been on the best of terms with William; though his uncle, Conan, William's enemy, died so opportunely on the eve of

* Mr. Freeman reminds us that (quite the reverse of "Saxon" usage) prelates seem to have had a very small place in Norman debates; they, as well as the *tiers état*, had disappeared as the Council came to be substituted for the old Norse Thing. At Lillebonne, Odo was the only bishop present.

the invasion, that men at once said William had poisoned him. The official description—always “French and English,” never “Normans and Saxons”—is the true one. The men who followed the consecrated banner were a motley host in whom the Gallo-Roman element so strongly prevailed as almost to warrant M. Thierry's dictum that the Conquest was a sort of return of the Heracleids, a tardy vengeance wreaked by the kinsmen of the old Britons on the descendants of those who had dispossessed them.

But we can only glance at Mr. Freeman's abstract of Norman history; it may be read with interest even by those who know Sir F. Palgrave's work. Particularly valuable to the beginner in history is his estimate of his authorities—Dudo, Dean of St. Quintin, Flodoard of Rheims, and Richer of the same city, for the period up to 998; William of Poitiers, and William of Jumièges, for the life of their namesake, the Conqueror. It is clear that the Norman settlement in France produced far more valuable results to France than that of Guthrum in England did to England. It made France; while the establishment of the *danelagu* helped to unmake England. The French story, indeed, is not a cheerful one; it reads like one long reign of Ethelred the Unready. Nevertheless, the Carolingians (Karlings we will not call them) have been unfairly depreciated; the divisions in Charles the Great's empire were inevitable, and the amount of unity retained was actually a further source of weakness. By the Rouen settlement Charles the Simple gained at the expense of the Duchy of Orleans; above all, he got two rival vassals instead of one. Rolf was faithful to him, and received, as the prize of fidelity, the Bessin (Bayeuxland), where there had been a “Saxon” colony even in Roman times, and where heathen rites and Norse speech lived on long after a few proper names like Dieppe (Dieppe-dal, deep dale), and Caudebec (Cauldbeck, cold brook) were all that remained of the old tongue to the Rouennois. The Cotentin (Constantina, from Coutances) was wrested from the Bretons at the time when a namesake and ancestor of the ungrateful Alan took refuge with Athelstan. In the Bessin, Mr. Freeman finds “a marked difference between the sturdy Norse yeoman and the diminutive French soldier, whose presence shows that the glory of Normandy is gone.” Even the superficial traveller must notice in the unusual amount of drunkenness in the district, an evidence that the old Norse leaven still works; while, in the comely dark faces, with trim, well-knit limbs, side by side, in market and fair, with the loose-limbed, grey-eyed men whom he expects to

hear talking "Wiltshire," he may find a proof that the present race is not homogeneous. Apropos of Normandy, Mr. Freeman brings in a remark about the Channel Islands, "far happier (he says) than Orkney in having a good local government, so much preferable to 'the privilege' of sending up a member to Parliament."

Of the Norman princes the two most notable features are: the looseness with which they wore the marriage tie—a looseness universal in the North, and to which Eastern and Northern Scotland partly owes her discreditable position in the registrar's returns; and their fidelity to their liege-lord when once they had settled whether they should *commend themselves* to Laôn or to Paris, to Lewis or to Hugh. In proof of the first we find duke after duke of more than doubtful birth; Richard the Fearless, for instance—(Miss Yonge's book about whom, "*The Little Duke*," will be far pleasanter reading to most boys and girls than Mr. Freeman's somewhat alarming "*English History for Children*")—was son of William Longsword, and Sprota, a Breton, and at best only a "Danish wife." The other point, too, comes out again and again. The Duke of Rouen, though a turbulent, is a useful, and, on the whole, a trusty vassal. The relations between France and Normandy in the early days of the Conqueror are creditable to both; the French king efficiently protects young William against his rebel vassals, fighting furiously on his side at Val-ès-dunes; and though afterwards there is war between the two it is not William's fault; he more than repays his liege-lord's faithful guardianship. An important point to consider is the way in which everything in England since the "Saxon" settlement had been tending to unity—first, there were separate kingdoms, at one time independent, then dependent; next hereditary earldormanships; and then earldoms filled up by the king and the Witan; while in France everything had tended to division—first, there were local governors, like the later English earls; then hereditary counts; then dependent sovereigns, very loosely bound to their over-lords. In England the king's power was limited all England over, but it was obeyed within those limits all England over. In France each king was supreme in Laôn, or Paris, or Rouen, or Poitiers, or Toulouse, but he had no power beyond it. When, therefore, the counts of Paris annexed these dependent kingdoms one by one, it annexed them to this same state of total dependence, and so France became a despotism for the masses, while still preserving more equality between the king and the great nobles than ever existed in England. One more point is to be noted in old Normandy: the peasants were in a much lower position

than the English ceorls even in their depressed state, but then in Normandy the class of thralls was almost unrepresented. The atrocities which marked the repression of the peasants' revolt in the days of Richard the Good show the low esteem in which the serfs were held; but serfs could and did revolt, while thralls naturally never thought of such a thing.

Of Ethelred, the king without *rede*, Mr. Freeman says he is the only one of Egbert's line who is at once a bad man and a bad king. The "buyings off" began in his reign, advised, by the way, by the Bishop of Ramsbury;* but the strangest feature of the reign is the inexplicable treason of Edric, which so often seemingly hindered an effectual blow from being dealt against the Danes. Treasonable mismanagement, however, was the order of the day; when a great fleet had been got together by the first recorded assessment of "ship-money," it is dispersed because Brithric and Wulfnoth quarrel. Indeed, as the chronicle says, "when man should go out against the Danes, then went the force home, and when they were east, then man held the force west, and when they were at the south, then was our force at the north . . . and there was no head man, and one shire would not help another, and there was no rede in the Witan."

Mr. Freeman attempts an excuse for all this by making the old remark that a constitutional government cannot act freely; Prussia, in 1866, struck a quicker blow than the United States could have struck. But the truth is the kingdom was still imperfectly welded together, and under a weak king this imperfection, and the personal jealousies of the Witan, came out. Ethelred, however, like most weak men, could be violent enough in the wrong direction. Not sluggishness, but restlessness, was his failing. While the Danes were harrying England, he was off ravaging Cumberland and Man, and attacking Wales, because they had refused to pay danegeld; he even threatened Normandy because the Danish fleets had been allowed to shelter in Norman ports. There are only two persons in his reign on whom we can look back with pleasure. One is Brithnoth, hero of Maldon, which battle (A.D. 991) is sung in a glorious lay preserved in Thorpe's *Analecta of Anglo-Saxon Poetry* (p. 131), and translated in Conybeare's *Illustrations of Anglo-Saxon Poetry*. The same episode occurred there of

* His diocese included Wilts and part of Berks. Episcopal cities have strangely changed their sites. Norwich was at Elmham; Chichester at Selsea; Exeter at Crediton and Bodmin; the huge diocese of Lincoln had for its see the village of Dorchester, near Oxford.

"the dauntless three," which has immortalised Horatius and his friends. The English were defeated,

"For than weredth thar on felda	"For then were there on the field
Folk tod-wæmed	Folk done to death
Seyld-burh tobrocen . . ."	Shield-wall through-broken ;"

but it was a glorious defeat.

The other light in a dark time is Ulfcytel (the name sounds Danish), who made a mighty stand in East Anglia, at Thetford and elsewhere ; he afterwards fell in the last of Edmund's six famous battles.

Sweyn Mr. Freeman rightly characterises as a mere barbarous destroyer ; for Canute (he will call him Cnut—why not Knut at once ?) he has a large meed of praise. He was elected at Southampton at the same time that the London Witan (and London was already far more important than Augusta had ever been) was choosing Edmund, who fought his rival with varying success at Pen Selwood, at Sherstone, at London, Brentford, Otford, and Assandun (in Essex, on the Crouch), all within seven months. Canute had a policy : he aimed at consolidating a great Scandinavian kingdom with England for its centre. His plan was defeated, and the way for the Norman Conquest was prepared by the badness of his sons, who so wore out English loyalty that no dynasty could resist an unsuccessful battle. His whole policy, however, including the well-merited killing of the traitor Eadric, tended towards a unity in which the English should be first, the Danes second ; and his famous letter from Rome to his people shows that he had their confidence, and a good share of their love. There was peace in his days, and (as we shall see by-and-by in Godwin's case) much was forgiven to a man who sternly repressed disturbing evil-doers. How Canute came to marry Emma, Ethelred's widow, at least ten years his senior, even Mr. Freeman cannot tell—whether from policy, or smitten by the still unfaded charms of her who had been styled in the old rhymes "*Normannorum gemma*." The policy, if such it was, turned out badly ; his death was the signal for what almost became a civil war. The unpopularity of Hardicanute with the English Danes encouraged Leofric to break the marriage compact made with Emma, and to set up Harold.

Godwin now comes into notice as the supporter of Hardicanute, whose character is sufficiently evidenced by his treatment of his brother's body, and by his cruel order for the sack of Worcester, to revenge the death of two of his house-carles. The sack of Worcester reminds us of that of Liege by Charles the Bold before the eyes of Louis XI.

No wonder these sons of Canute had inspired in the English people an invincible determination (in which even the *danelagu* acquiesced) to have an English king: "All folk chose Edward to be king at London." The Confessor, brother of the Alfred whose death is such a stain on Godwin, belonged to the younger branch; the sons of Edmund Ironside were far away, and Sweyn Estrithson, who Mr. Freeman thinks would have made a far better king, was not, in the then temper of the nation, to be thought of. Edward was very unwilling to accept the crown; he lingered ten months in Normandy, and was only persuaded at last by Godwin and Lyfing, Bishop of Worcester, the former of whom was ostentatiously loyal, though naturally the king-elect must, in spite of all the powerful earl's professions, have shrunk from the man who had been charged with his brother's death. With Edward's reign England enters into the circle of European powers, from which she had dropped out; the foreign embassies at his coronation preluded the foreign influence against which the appointment of Harold as under-king during the last decade of the reign, and his subsequent election, represented a strong though ineffectual reaction. Edward's character has been very differently estimated; after a time his life came to be written for purposes of religious edification rather than as history; but Edward the man, apart from Edward the saint, must have had some good qualities, or else even the fact of his having been the last of the race of Cerdic would scarcely have accounted for the affection with which the thoughts of an oppressed people turned back to him. Mr. Freeman makes a strong point of his habit of giving way to unseemly fits of wrath, and of his love of hunting—unpardonable in the eyes of the writer on field sports in the *Fortnightly*: "His time (he says) was oddly divided between prayers and the unsaintly sport of hunting, with regard to which he was far from sharing Anselm's feelings;" and he quotes from William of Malmesbury the threat which, *nobili percitus ira*, he vented on the churl who had tried to turn the royal hunt aside from his wheat: "By God and His Mother I'll hurt you some day if I can!" We may argue from such hints that perhaps Edward's backwardness in some kingly duties was owing to a sense of unfitness; he may have kept in the background because he knew the infirmity of his temper.

The chief point against him is his devotion to foreign favourites; his heart was Norman, and under him the land began to be filled with *transmarini*. His clerical appointments lead to increasing reference to Rome; after 1049 our clergy appear

in the synods of Rheims, Maintz, &c. The worthless Robert of Jumièges is made Bishop of London, and is raised, in 1051, to the primacy. Ulf, of whom the chronicle says, "It is a shame to tell what Ulf did," was raised in 1049 from being king's chaplain to the vast Bishopric of Dorchester; and by their calumnies against Godwin these two brought about the banishment of the Great Earl and his family. It is unlucky for his saintship that Edward's greatest piece of energy is his ride, at the outset of his reign, from Gloucester to Winchester, along with his three chief earls, to seize all the hoards of Emma, his mother, who had wholly neglected him after her Danish marriage: "*angustos filii jamdudum riserat annos*," says the chronicler. Of Edward's bishoprics Mr. Freeman gives an excellent map, one of many which add so much to the value of his book. They are very different from those of the present day (we have already noted some of the differences); and the changes explain a good many points in the secular history of the country. Here is our author's account of what happened in the North, in 995; the passage may serve, too, as a fair sample of his style:—

"The translation of the see of Bernicia from Cunegaceaster (Chester-le-Street), whither it had been removed from Lindisfarne, seems to be a forestalling of that general removal of bishoprics from smaller to more considerable towns which we shall find carried out systematically soon after the Norman Conquest. The body of St. Cuthbert and the episcopal throne of his successors were placed, by the happy choice of Ealdun, on that height whence the minster and castle of Durham still look down upon the river winding at their feet. In process of time the successors of Ealdun came to surpass all their episcopal brethren in wealth and in temporal authority. The prelate of Durham became one, and the more important, of the two English prelates whose worldly functions invested them with some faint shadow of the sovereign powers enjoyed by the princely churchmen of the empire. The Bishop of Ely in his island, the Bishop of Durham in his hill-fortress, possessed powers which no other English ecclesiastic was allowed to share. Aidan and Cuthberht had lived a hermit's life among their monks on their lonely island. Their successors grew into the Lords of a Palatinate, in which it was not the peace of the king, but the peace of the bishop which the wrong-doer was, in legal language, held to have broken. The external aspect of the city of itself suggests its peculiar character. Durham alone, among the English cities, with its highest point crowned not only by the minster, but by the vast castle of the prince-bishop, recalls to mind those cities of the empire, Lausanne, or Chur, or Setten, where the priest, who bore alike the sword and the pastoral staff, looked down from his fortified

height on a flock which he had to guard no less against worldly than against ghostly foes. Such a change could never have taken place if the see of St. Cuthberht had still lingered in its hermit-island; it could hardly have taken place if he had finished his wanderings on a spot less clearly marked out by nature for dominion. The translation of see to Durham by Ealdun is the turning point in the history of that great bishopric. And it is something more; it is deserving of notice in the general history of England as laying the foundation of a state of things which in England remained exceptional, but which, had it gained a wider field, would have made a lasting change in the condition of the country. The spiritual palatinate of Durham, and the temporal palatinate of Chester, stood alone in the possession of their extraordinary franchises. The unity of the kingdom was, therefore, not seriously endangered by the existence of these isolated principalities, especially as the temporal palatinate so early became an appanage of the heir to the crown. But had all bishoprics possessed the same rights as Durham, had all earldoms possessed the same rights as Chester, England could never have remained a consolidated monarchy. It must have fallen in pieces in exactly the same way that the empire did, and from essentially the same cause."

Important as he feels the Church to have then been, Mr. Freeman does not devote much space to its affairs. Godwin, whom he values chiefly as the father of Harold ("Godwin was a crafty, not always scrupulous, statesman; Harold was a hero"), is accused by almost all contemporaries of having robbed the Church. Of his general character it is hard to form a just estimate; "he was the last statesman of the modern type, the last man who shone in free debate in this country for many centuries." That all England, except a few Midland shires, was in the hands of one of his family from 1058 to 1065, shows he was sufficiently self-seeking. And this family was a troublesome one. Edith, the daughter, does not come off well in the affair of Cospatrik's murder. Of Sweyn we have spoken before; the Abingdon chronicle says of the Leominster abbess, "he kept her and let hi sythan faran hæm," to which Florence, of Worcester, adds, "Eo quod abbatissam quam corruperat in matrimonium habere non licuerit Danemarciam adierat." Beorn he foully murders close to the Godwins' seat, at Bosham, in Sussex, because Beorn and Harold had got his outlawry confirmed when Edward wanted to restore him in 1049. Their reason was because they held Sweyn's land; and Harold's conduct in the matter is by no means free from blame. The sudden restoration of Sweyn, when Bishop Aldred, the peacemaker, brings him back from Flanders, is among the unexplained mysteries of the time. Another is the sudden fall of the house of

Godwin, after the trouble with Eustace of Boulogne at Dover. In that matter Godwin took the right ground; but the change is very startling; we find him one day at Beversedge, with half England at his back, ready to fight the king and Earls Leofric and Siward at Gloucester, the battle being only stopped by Leofric's intercession, while a few days after a gemot meets in London to try him for Alfred's murder, and when he asks for a safe-conduct, that he may free his accusers, it is refused. Edward's biographer compares the great Earl to Joseph and Susanna, and other victims of misrepresentation, wondering that such a lot could befall him whose sons were "thoes cynges dyrlingas (darlings) and his dohtor thœm cynge bewedded and beawnod." The collapse of such a mayor of the palace is certainly remarkable; no doubt it was mainly due to the slanders of the Norman prelates. But the fall, no less than the rise, of such a man, "shows that the Danish conquest, and the slaughter of the old nobles, had strengthened the kingly power. The whole family shared their father's disgrace; Edith was put in Wherwell Nunnery, "ne omnibus suis parentibus patriam suspirantibus sola sterteret in plumâ," says William of Malmesbury, with a sneer taken from some Frenchman who was present. Robert, the primate, had already felt himself strong enough to refuse consecration to Spearhafoc, the chosen Bishop of London; and Norman castle-building went merrily on—in Herefordshire, for instance, where the name of Richard's castle, the castle whence "the Gal-Welsh (French, opposed to Bret-Welsh) men wrought harm and besmear," still clings to a parish. Godwin in exile took refuge at Baldwin's court, where he was by no means in evil case: "felicem se putabat (says William of Malmesbury) qui apud eum exsulari potuit." Baldwin interceded in vain for his return; but, meanwhile, Griffith of North Wales, "the last prince whom England had to fear," crushed the Norman lords of Herefordshire, and so the banished earl thought he might venture to return unbidden. Harold, with Leofwine, had been staying in Ireland; his landing at Porlock, on the coast of Exmoor, the opposition of the people (*Welsh-kind*, and, therefore, not so fond of the great "Saxon" family as Mr. Freeman is), the slaughter of "thirty good thegns" of Somerset and Devon, and Harold's fastings in expiation thereof before the Rood at Waltham, are facts well known to most readers. Harold, ill-received in Somerset, sailed off to join his father. London, Eastern Wessex, East Anglia (where Harold had been earl since he was twenty-three years old), declared for the exiled family; and the scene

which follows—the two armies confronting each other, and bloodshed being prevented only by Godwin's power of persuasion,—the grand old man, silver-tongued, going alone to the king's army—gives our author an opportunity of making one of his liveliest pictures. The flight of the Normans is described with evident glee: "The archbishop left behind his pallium and all Christendom in the land, even as God willed; for he had taken it on himself, even as God nilled," says the chronicler. The mickle-gemot, held, after old usage, in the open air, restores him and outlaws the Normans; "good law is decreed for all folk," in opposition to the "bad law" of the foreigners, who could not understand the grounds for the English indignation at Eustace's behaviour at Dover: "Godwin came back by force, indeed; but he was happier than Henry Bolingbroke or William of Orange; he had not to oust a bad king, but only to deliver a weak king from foreign thralldom." The only other noteworthy event, till Godwin's strange death at the Easter feast, in 1053, the tales about which Mr. Freeman calls "fictions for the comparative mythologist," is the raising of Stigand to the primacy, of which he managed to hold the temporalities along with his See of Winchester. His appointment gave a handle to the Normans; there was no pretence of canonical form. When after six years' delay, in 1058, Stigand did get his pallium, it was from the anti-pope, Benedict X.; hence his ministry was avoided, even Harold declined to be crowned by him. The fact is that Church and State, just at this time, were virtually one, as far as politics went; Rome was chiefly known as a place of pilgrimage, to which the English were bound to send Peter's pence; and the result shows that, in a state of society like that, the union of Church and State had evils of its own. "It is a pity (says our author) that Ælfrie, the elect of the Canterbury monks, was not made primate."

Of Godwin we need only say that he was the first man who, being neither king nor priest, stands forth in all the highest attributes of statesmanship, *dux felicitis memorie* (as he was styled), worthy to compare with the great parliamentary leaders of the thirteenth and fourteenth "centuries."

Harold at once succeeded to his father's earldom of Wessex, to the great joy of the nation. "Henceforward, as earl and as king, his career is one of just and vigorous government, of skill and valour in the field, and of unvarying forbearance and moderation towards political foes. He won and kept the devoted love of the English people; far harder, he won and kept the personal confidence and affection of a weak and wayward

prince." This is high praise; but we think it is fully warranted by facts. Harold got the kingdom more and more under his control. Florence calls him *subregulus*; and he controlled the kingdom for its good. He began the hard task of Church reform, and took a step in the right direction by raising the blameless Wolfstan to the See of Worcester. It was a hard task, for even Aldred, the Archbishop of York, held three dioceses, and was long refused the pallium on account of simony: * the head was corrupt as well as the members. Harold's zeal for education was great; he meant to bring Adelard, of Liege, over to Waltham. His energy was shown in his dealings with Griffith, of which Lord Lytton gives such a picturesque account. He anticipated the policy of Edward I. of following the Welsh into their fastnesses; and when Griffith ("se was cynning ofer eall Weal-cyn") was killed by his own people, Harold, perhaps out of policy, married his widow, Earl Ælgar's daughter. *Strenuus dux Haroldus*, the admiring Florence may well call him, invaluable helpmeet to a king *columbinæ puritatis*, indeed, but also *miræ simplicitatis et innocentie*.† Unhappily, as it turned out, his brother Tostig was put into the earldom of the grand old Siward (he who had himself dressed in his armour when he felt his death approaching, "that he might not die like a cow"). Tostig was, of all the brothers, the one whom the king liked best; but, whatever may have been his boyish character when he used to quarrel with Harold, his conduct in Northumberland shows that he had degenerated into a cruel tyrant. Northumberland revolts; a rebel gemot, held at York, elects Morcar (1065); Tostig's house carles are slaughtered, and he absurdly and pettishly accuses his brother of fomenting the revolt. Edward wants to fight in his favourite's behalf; but the nation will not fight, and Tostig, banished, goes to Baldwin, father of his wife Judith. We have not noticed the coming over (by special invitation,—Aldred being sent as far as Cologne to bring him) of Edmund Ironside's son Edward. Strangely enough, when he came, he was kept out of the Confessor's presence; a fact which Lappenberg ascribes to Harold's party. Mr. Freeman suggests that it was owing to illness, or to the intrigues of the Norman courtiers. Palgrave and Pearson do not hesitate to

* See the curious story of how the pallium was at last given when Tostig, who, with others, had gone to plead for Aldred, was seized by brigands just outside Rome.

† According to the Norman writers, even Harold's religious reforms were unscrupulously carried out: e.g. Walter de Mapes's story of the Berkeley nuns.

say, what even no Norman slanderer even breathed, that Harold killed him. No doubt his death made Harold aspire to the throne, the Atheling, his orphan, being so young, and (as he is well depicted by Lord Lytton) so un-English.

And now it is time to look at Normandy, to which Mr. Freeman devotes, on principle, a considerable space. Of Norman William he says truly :—

"No man ever did his work more effectually; if he was not so morally great as Timoleon, Alfred or Washington, or even as Alexander, Charles the Great or Canute, at least he must not be classed among the mere foes of their species—the Nebuchadnezzars, Sweyns and Bonapartes. . . The English Chronicler does him justice because he was writing under the lawless demon Rufus. He displayed the highest embodiment of fixed purpose and unbending will. Sylla alone comes up to him in his cool self-satisfaction after a life of self-seeking. . . It marks the man that he was able to take advantage of exceptional circumstances; a minor and a bastard, he began under a double disadvantage; and Herleva's child, who had shown his strength as soon as he was born by seizing the straw on the floor in a vigorous grasp, actually managed to conquer Normandy by the help of France, and then France by the help of Normandy.* . . Subtle he was; he showed it in the clever web of fallacy which he wove about England, making an unjust aggression appear a holy war; but, personally chaste in a dissolute court, he was never cruel, except when insulted. At Alençon he behaved with barbarity; but then the townsfolk had thrown skins at his troops, crying, 'Hides, hides for the tanner' (as the *Roman de Rou* has it, 9458 :

La pel la pel al parmetier
Pur ceo ke al Falieze fu nez).

He swore, par la resplender Dè, his favourite oath, he would prune away (*esmunder*) those insolent men. Throwing fire over the walls, a plan whereby he took several strong places, he forced the town to surrender, and then cut off the hands and feet of many of the defenders."

We must not think much of his leniency to the rebel barons: to kill a noble prisoner was in those days very unusual; when Edward I. put Nigel Bruce and others to death there rose a cry of indignation from the nobles of the whole island. He was a great promoter of learning. To Bec, founded by Herlwin, he attracted Anselm, the father of dogmatic theology. Lanfranc of Pavia, whose knowledge of Greek and civil law had obtained him abundance of pupils at Avranches, left them lest his heart should be lifted up, and

* We must remark, that if Henry had not stood by him at the beginning against the great wicked house of Belesme, he could not have made good his footing. Cf. *Roman de Rou*, 8105.

Par li conseil el Rei de France
Ki l'maintiendra o sa poissance.

took refuge at Bec. There he is said to have been so obedient, that when the prior, an illiterate man, bade him say *docere*, he at once complied. Before long, however, William drew him to himself, and made him his chief agent in disciplinary reform; and we must presume it was the "holy duty of winning England to the Roman obedience" which led him to give up his retirement. Both these men, and also the learned Theobald, the Conqueror brought over to England. William's early Church appointments had by no means been so creditable; he had promoted the wicked Malger, and Odo the restless fighting prelate, who ended his days at Palermo on his way to the Crusade, keeping in both these cases to Norman precedent, which made the Church a provision for ducal bastards or younger sons. The French bishops generally were much inferior in position to those of Germany, who were mostly princes holding direct of the emperor, their cities being free imperial cities; hence the struggle about investiture was, for the emperors, far more a matter of life and death than for the French kings.

Was William a conscious hypocrite? Surely not. It is hard to put ourselves *en rapport* with a man who could believe that a south wind might be brought by walking the bones of St. Valery in solemn procession round his host, or that by putting a number of relics under the shrine on which Harold swore, the vengeance of the Norman saints would fall on him if he broke his oath. It was a strange age; but certainly not singular in this that men often outraged ordinary right and justice, believing that, by so doing, they were doing God service. The day is gone by, too, for puerile mocking at the zeal which showed itself in the foundation of religious houses; as Mr. Freeman says, "the Norman Benedictines in the eleventh, and the English Cistercians in the twelfth century; the Friars in the thirteenth, the Secular revulsion in the fourteenth, and the Jesuits in the sixteenth, all arose from the desire to reform."

Another good point in William was his rigid justice; though his worse nature came out in England, the Peterborough Chronicle can still say of his strict police, "*betwyx othrum thingum . . . swa that an man the himsylv aht were mighte faran ofer his rice (reich realm) mid his bosum full golde ungederad.*" Mr. Freeman's account of him, though very full, is never tedious; often it is most lively, illustrated at every turn by Robert Wace's (Canon of Bayeux, temp. Henry II.) poem, the *Roman de Rou*. We never met a more spirited passage than that which tells how, when the Bayeux country was all against him, William, in fear of his life, rode all

night between Bayeux and the sea, and passing the Church and Castle of Rye very early in the morning, met Hubert, lord of Rye (father of Eudes, afterwards dapifer regis, and sheriff of Essex, notable for his kindness to the English), and got from him a fresh horse, and the escort of his three stout sons. As the *Roman* has it, 8846 :

Hubert de Rie ert à sa porte
 Entre li mostier (monastery) et sa motte (castle earth-wall);
 Guillamme vit désaturné
 E sun cheval tuil tressué.

Of course, a great point to be settled is the nature of Edward's promise, and of Harold's engagement to William. Mr. Freeman thinks there was some promise and some oath; but then "the king had no power of bequest, only of recommendation. The Norman tales about it are, most of them, grotesquely impossible; but William's struggle to gain the hand of Matilda of Flanders, who was a descendant of Alfred, showed his anxiety to strengthen in every way his claim." * There was some promise on Harold's part, whether connected or not with a betrothal to one of William's daughters, who (says the story), though a mere child, felt so proud of having been affianced to a king, that she never would marry (Lord Lytton makes Harold pledged unwittingly by Matilda's artifice). . . So much Mr. Freeman thinks is negatively proved by the ominous silence of the English annalists, who would have been eager to deny it if they could. William wished to entrap Harold; and, homage sitting lightly on the liegeman in those days, Harold did homage to one in whose power he was, and who had a sort of claim on his gratitude for rescuing him from the inhospitable Guy of Ponthieu. Harold's oath could not affect the choice of the English people; his own plea was that it was null without the consent of the Witan; anyhow, he was wrong not in breaking but in taking such an oath; and yet we may judge of its value to William from its having moved the mind of so brave a man and so loving a brother as Gurth.

William's claim was based on various grounds, to satisfy various classes of minds. It was partly kinship, partly bequest, partly the oath, partly vengeance for the murdered Alfred, partly championship of the Church outraged in the persons of the outlawed prelates, Robert and Ulf. Thus the

* Though so young, Matilda was a widow, mother of two sons by a father of no great distinction. William's difficulty was, as usual, about the "prohibited degrees." Lanfranc at first opposed him; but afterwards took his part.

war became a very crusade; in fact, England's comparative independence of Rome was her real crime in Hildebrand's eyes. William's appeal to the Pope rightly appeared to that able and ambitious pontiff a most valuable precedent. Then there was the vulgar gross motive for vulgar minds, the gold and lands. Orderic describes the invaders as "*Anglicæ prædæ inhiantes*," though, of course, they took their cue from their leader, and blamed the English "for ingratitude to those who came to deliver them from a tyrannical usurper." Lanfranc—whose moral worth, we think, Mr. Freeman rates far too highly—taught William how he might make his invasion a holy war. It was, no doubt, a mark of advancing civilisation to appeal to the public opinion of Europe; though the assumed inability to understand the force of the popular election, which had put Harold on the throne, is remarkable.

Meanwhile, Edward was drawing near his end, and the nation was full of anxiety about the succession. Hereditary ideas were very weak. Edgar was not the son of a crowned king and lady-queen; he was a minor. When three other minors had been chosen, Dunstan, a priest, was the foremost man in the realm; but now there was a glorious under-king. Edward's dying commendation was very important, and of it there is no doubt. The *Vita Eadwardi*, written for his widow Edith, says, on the authority of a foreign eye-witness, "*porrecta manu* (the very attitude in the Bayeux tapestry) *ad prædictum nutricium fratrum Haroldum hanc inquit cum omni regno tutandam commendo*." As to the election, Florence says, "*Subregulus Haroldus electus est ab omnibus Angliæ primatibus quem Rex ante decessum regni successorem elegerat*." "Every word of this (remarks Mr. Freeman) disposes of some Norman calumny, and Florence must have known; he would have it all direct from Bishop Wolfstan." Practically, however, the "all" means all south of the Humber; and there was an uneasy doubt how Northumberland would receive the chosen of Wessex. Thus Harold has the bequest and the election, though he has not the hereditary right. Even William of Poitiers says he held *Edwardi dono in ipsius fine*; and Henry of Huntingdon, though he is full of abuse, calling him *consul perjurus*, does not deny the main facts. Of his coronation the Abingdon Chronicle says, "*Her weardh (here was) Harold eorl eac (eke) to cyngge gehalgod (hallowed)*," that of Peterborough states the bequest, and adds, "*and eac men hine thæрто gecuron and waes gebletsod (blessed) to Cyng on Twelftan messedæg*." So Edward dies a good king at the last. The gleeman in the Worcester Chronicle sings of him:

Waes à (aye) blidhe mod (blithe of mood)
Bealeless (baleless) cyng—

—good, in Mr. Freeman's sense, because "his last earthly wish was that Harold should succeed him."

That Epiphany was a high day which saw the burial of him who was so soon to become a miracle worker,* (the people forgetting that the peace in his time had been due to the strong mind and arm of Harold), and the crowning of the first English king not of the line of Cerdic, except the royal Danes. Northumberland did resist; but Harold goes there, and his gift of speech is as great as his father's: he and Wulfstan bring it back to allegiance. Sister Edith is almost the only openly disaffected person in the realm.

Then events thicken: William's challenge is sent; the comet appears; William assembles his nobles at Lillebonne; they dislike the enterprise, and urge that they are not bound to serve beyond sea; William Fitz-Osborne's crafty trick forces them to do William's will. Then Tostig, moved, doubtless, by Judith, through her sister Matilda, is urged to invade the country. He lands in Lindesey, but is driven off, and takes refuge with his cousin Sweyn of Denmark, who prudently urges him to give up his claim, offering him a Danish earldom instead. Harold Hardrada Sigurdson, the Lord Peterborough of that day, well known for his adventures at Byzantium in the time of the Empress Zoë, is attracted by the promise of a new kingdom if he will unfurl the landwaster, though his wise men tell him that every one of Harold's house-carles is worth two Norwegians. His saga (by Snorro) gives a glowing but clearly inaccurate account of the campaign. We need only notice the slaughter which indirectly helped William so much at Fulford, where Edwin and Morcar were defeated: it was so heavy that a ditch was choked with English, so that the Norsemen walked across upon their bodies. York surrenders, and Northumbria swears fealty to the invader, who does not seem to have employed the vast treasures that he bought, seeing that his "lump of Byzantine gold, which twelve strong youths could scarcely carry," was captured after Stamfordbridge. Our Harold is ill when the news of the invasion reaches him; he pushes on, not without an agony of soul-wrestling before the Waltham rood. He is comforted by a vision of his holy predecessor, the men who related which, anyhow, did not think him a usurper. He surprises his namesake and defeats him,

* He was canonised, in 1161, by the influence of Henry II.

but with sad loss on his own side. Mr. Freeman describes *con amore* the incidents of the battle and at its close the Berserker rage which seized the Norsemen, and set them rushing madly on the English when their king and Tostig had both fallen. Three days after this William landed (September 28) at Pevensey.

Of his preparations, we must notice that his embassies to foreign powers were not over-well received: the Emperor remained neutral, though he seems to have allowed subjects of the empire to join if they pleased. Philip was very much opposed to the enterprise, naturally not wishing to see Normandy gain a great increase of strength. William undertakes to hold England as a fief of France, and then Philip is content to do as much as Henry had done and no more. The Bastard's chief success is at Rome, owing, as we said, to Archdeacon Hildebrand's influence. The *Roman de Rou* (1152) thus describes the Pope's presents:—

Un gonfaun è un anel
Mult precios è richeè bel
Si come il dit de soz la pierre
Aveit un des cheveuls St. Pierre.

On the formation of the fleet, of which the *Mora* (puzzling name), Matilda's gift, was the guide-ship, with its chequered sails by day and its beacon-fire by night, Mr. Freeman is very rich in details. Its gathering was ushered in by the double religious foundation at Caen (why not at Rouen?) and by the taking of the veil by Cicely,—“the sacrifice as of modern Iphigenia.”

William's strength of character is shown by his having been able to keep such a motley host from plundering the neighbourhood during the weary time through which the south wind refused to blow. What astonishes us is that Harold, with his vaunted generalship, did not send over his fleet, which was idly cruising off the Downs, to attack and burn the Duke's transports. His not doing so is one more proof how little root his family had taken in England. He was wanted elsewhere: as he says when the news is brought to him (October 1), while sitting at the victory-feast at York, by a south Saxon thane who had seen the Normans set up their fortifications and had straightway spurred northward:—

Mais issi plout el Rei celeste;
Je ne puis mie partout estre.—(*Rou* 11838.)

But still he ought to have been able to depute some one to act for him. Instead of this, his fleet, at the very time it

is wanted, sails away to London, and his militia (*landfyrd*), which had been kept from harvest and other matters for an unusual time, disperses and leaves the coast defenceless. There was bad management here; an important position like Hastings ought not to have been left in such a state that it surrendered at once. In Ethelred such lack of precautions would have been held to savour of unreadiness. Might not Harold have kept his militia together after the fatal 8th of September, by judicious liberality? Anyhow, he is accused of meanness with regard to the plunder from Stamfordbridge—meanness which Mr. Freeman explains as anxiety to keep together the sinews of war for a long campaign.

Mr. Freeman gives a list of all the English at Senlac who are known by name—such as Godric and Thurkill,* of Abingdon; “their names should be a trumpet-call in all English ears for all time.” England then, however, was far from being united. Northumberland and almost all Mercia stood aloof. It was strictly *Saxon* against Norman. “Edwin and Morcar wished (says Mr. Freeman) to divide England; William (they thought) had no quarrel with them, and would be content with the southern half of the island.” We do not think the two northern earls had any such definite plan; they may have fancied that William’s supremacy (supposing him to conquer) would only be a temporary visitation; but blind jealousy of the house of Godwin was reason enough for acting as they did, without attributing to them any deep political views.

We have already discussed the charge of violence to Gurth and to his mother brought against Harold; to the same class of charges belong the statement that when the most galling message man could send to man was sent to him by William, it was only by Gurth’s interference that Harold was prevented from injuring the ambassador.

Among many contradictions and uncertainties, nothing is more uncertain than the numbers of the invaders; they vary from 60,000 to 14,000 in the Norman writers themselves: the English naturally make them “an innumerable host.” On the contrary, our native writers explain the defeat by charging Harold with having risked a battle with insufficient forces; even William of Malmesbury says *pauci*, though he adds, *at manu promptissimi*. This Mr. Freeman thinks the correct view; “Harold did not want a large force, for his tactics

* He was the only man to whom it was vouchsafed to see the miracle of the bowed and bleeding rood at Waltham while Harold knelt before it. Was the stout Berkshireman losing faith in the cause?

were purely defensive: he had seen Norman tactics, and he knew that nothing but the shield-wall could stand against the Norman horse. Better for him if he had only had his comitatus and his house-carles; for it was the gallant but unsteady levies of London and Kent which he was obliged to enrol who lost him the day."

Harold takes his ground: Mr. Freeman has measured the ground; he delayed his third volume to get better local details. He paints to nature the quagmire, the main hill on which were the two standards (the *dragon* of Wessex and the *fighting-man* of the king himself), the advanced mamelon, the malfosse, all the features of the scene.

He details the messages from duke to king: William sends three proposals; Harold shall resign, or he shall govern *for William as under-king*, or he shall fight him in single combat. Why Harold did not accept this last alternative is hardly explained by our author's remark, "Harold could not separate himself from his people; his cause was theirs." . . . Then came the preparations: "the English keep the eve of the battle, not (as Norman slanderers have said) in drinking to excess, but in hearing from glee-men the old songs of their land, the lays of Maldon and Thetford and Assandun, the lay of Edward so lately dead. This was surely better than to be in that strange frame of mind in which a strange religious excitement can make unprovoked aggression seem a holy war."

Our author's account of the battle is livelier than even Lord Lytton's, and it has the advantage of being borne out at every turn by contemporary authorities. We have the story of the hauberk turned the wrong way, which the Duke's ready wit interpreted that he should be turned from duke to king; the account of the arms on both sides—the only mace-bearers were William and his brother Odo; very different was this warrior-priest from Harold's uncle Ælfwig and his Peterborough monks, with their hair-shirts under their armour. The battle-cries rise from both hosts. The *Roman* says (13193):—

"Normanz escrient Dex aie

La gent Englesche ut ('out') s'escrie;"

but "Holy Rood" and "God Almighty" were also heard, probably from the irregular levies.

Everyone knows the general plan of the battle; but not everyone considers the difficulty of practising twice over the manœuvre of a feigned flight, which if not successful may easily become a real one. Mr. Freeman does justice both

to the *elan* of the Norman troops and to their tenacity, in both of which he compares them with the French of the present day. William of Poitiers speaks of the *corpulentia* (bulk) of the English, who are certainly in the tapestry made bigger than the Normans, for Harold's tactics made William's stratagem possible, when we blame our countrymen for being twice taken in by the Norman device we must remember how hard it must have been to *stand at bay* hour after hour (the fight lasted from sunrise to sunset); we need not wonder that, as the records tell, every now and then some Englishman, unable to hold out, bounded forth like a deer, and rushed to meet his death. Gurth and Leofwine had fallen before (not, as in most accounts, after) the fatal arrow-shooting began. Gurth kills William's horse, and nearly kills him, but dies by his hand. Then comes the last act; and then the shameful ill-treatment, and that by noble knights, of Harold's dead body—one cutting off a leg, another gashing the face, another dragging out the entrails. With Harold's death the battle virtually ended: Mr. Freeman compares it with Aughrim (for which see Macaulay), where St. Ruth's tactics were like Harold's, and where the leader's death ruined the cause. Yet the fighting still went on; not a man of the *comitatus* left the field; they died like the *soldarii* of an Aquitanian chief, or the foster-brothers of a Scotch or Irish Gael. The slaughter of Normans, too, was heavy; Ordericus says 15,000 of them fell.

For the legends of Harold's escape, and for proof that, after a first resolve to leave his body to kites and crows, William yielded to Malet's intercession so far as "to bury him on the coast which he had guarded so well," we refer the reader to Mr. Freeman or to Lord Lytton. The disfigured body is found by the love-sharpened eyes of Edith of the Swan-neck. Some of us remember Mr. Kingsley's lines—

"Rousing erne and sallow glede,
Rousing grey wolf from his feed,
Over franklin earl and thane,
Heaps of mother-naked slain,
Round the red field, pacing slow,
Went that Swan-neck, white as snow,
Never blushed nor turned away
Till she found him where he lay."

Mr. Freeman is eloquent about her conduct—"the most touching episode in English history, showing what woman's love can do and dare." One of his appendices shows that Harold had three sons by the Swan-neck (he had one by Grif-

fith's widow, Morcar's sister); so that Lord Lytton's idea of the love being purely spiritual is an error, though Mr. Kingsley's way of pushing forward the sensual view of the connection shows how far we are advanced in "muscularity" since the days when *Harold* was written. The battle was in every sense a decisive one. All the chroniclers, on whichever side, bear full testimony to its importance. William of Malmesbury says (iii. 215), "*Illa fuit dies fatalis Angliæ, funestum excidium dulcis patriæ.*" Florence of Worcester puts forward Harold's death as being (as indeed it was) the "fatal turning-point:" "*Heu ipsemet cecidit crepusculi temporibus.*" Henry of Huntingdon is still more explicit; that day (he says) made it a disgrace to be called an Englishman, yea, made the English cease to be a people: "*Quum jam Domini justam voluntatem super Anglorum gentem Normanni complissent, nec jam vix aliquis princeps de progenie Anglorum esset in Angliâ, sed omnes ad servitutem et ad mœrorem redacti essent; ita etiam ut Anglicum vocari esset opprobrio*" (lib. vi.); and again (lib. vii.): "*Declaratum constat quomodò Dominus salutem et honorem genti Anglorum pro meritis abstulerit, et jam populum non esse jusserit.*"

Whether this (on which M. Thierry, and others who widen to the utmost the breach between Norman and Saxon, ground their belief) is strictly true or only rhetorical, certain it is that Senlac settled the fate of England. William is in no hurry to move on London; probably the Normans there—Bishop William among them—tell him that delay is sure to breed dissension among the surviving English. While Edwin and Morcar are first feebly intriguing against the Atheling, and then joining in his election, the victor, receiving the surrender of Dover and Canterbury, and reading a cruel lesson to the men of Romney, makes a circuit to terrify London. The city soon submits: "They had vowed, king and people, to stand by each other (says our author), and nobly they did so;" but when he was gone there was no one whom they could stand by;* and even Hereward's rising would not have taken place if William had gone on as mildly as he began.

We have thus followed Mr. Freeman as far as he has yet gone; some day we hope to return to him, and discuss not only the rest of his *Norman Conquest*, but his long-promised *History of Federal Governments*. Meanwhile we must be content to adopt his own plan, and to abstain from "general

* All the sons of Godwin had died except the unsatisfactory Wolfnoth.

views " which often degenerate into idle talk. There is always something in success which baffles definition; and the Conquest was eminently a success. What would have been the present state of England if the battle had gone the other way it is idle to inquire. We may remark that, but for the Conquest, England would have broken up into separate kingdoms like those of Ireland; it had not nationality enough to cohere without the pressure of a *force majeure*. If, at last, national unity had grown up within, we should have been far less mixed up with foreign politics (how would France have developed without the pressure of English invasion?). There would have been no rival people in Scotland, none of the good as well as evil resulting from the long struggle. Ireland would have been sooner assimilated; and Celts throughout the British Isles would have had far harder lines than they had under the Normans. That there was no long struggle was due to the peculiar temper of the "Saxon" people, who know when they are beaten, and do not (like Celts and savage races — *e.g.*, the Maoris) go on fighting when all is lost; they were reasonable enough, then as always, to measure their enemy's strength.

We have to thank Mr. Freeman for a valuable contribution to English history, and for a thoroughness and honesty of purpose rarely equalled. If to some he will seem wanting in "grasp" and "breadth of view," it is because his object is to write history and not rhetoric; well were it if his more rhetorical predecessors had been as careful to give the authorities for their magnificently sweeping assertions. The quiet irony which marks some of his controversial passages bespeaks the man who has so often in the *Saturday Review* "shown up" historical pretenders. Only on two points are we at issue with him—for the brief which he holds for his hero never leads him to warp or disguise the smallest fact—first (as we said above), on his view of the total disappearance of the Roman British civilisation, a merely sentimental question; next (a far graver matter), because he fails to note the generic difference between the Witan and our Parliament. The Witan was the old Hellenic *βουλή*, in which, perhaps, theoretically every freeman had a voice; Parliament finds its only Greek type in the Amphictyonic Council, a representative body. Even so it was the Church Councils in England (the first in which the principle of representation was recognised), and not the Witan or the mickle gemote which gave a pattern to Simon De Montfort.

- ART. V.—1. *The Licensing Laws* [from *Meliora*, April, 1869]. London: James Clarke and Co., Fleet-street.
2. *The Educational Condition and Requirements of One Square Mile in the East End of London*. Supplement to the *Journal of the Society of Arts*, March 25th, 1870. Prepared at the Request of the Council. By GEORGE C. T. BARTLEY. London: Bell and Daldy, York-street, Covent Garden.
3. *An Inquiry into the Causes of the Present Long-continued Depression in the Cotton Trade; with Suggestions for its Improvement*. By a COTTON MANUFACTURER (Mr. William Hoyle). Third Edition. London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co.
4. *An Inquiry into the Existing State of Education in Richmond, Twickenham, Mortlake, and Neighbourhood*. By T. PAYNTER ALLAN, Commissioner of the Society of Arts.
5. *Social Politics in Great Britain and Ireland*. By PROFESSOR KIRK, Edinburgh. Inscribed to the Right Honourable W. E. Gladstone. London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co.
6. *Report by the Committee on Intemperance for the Lower House of Convocation of the Province of Canterbury*. (Printed and Circulated by Order of the Lower House.) With Copious Appendix, containing Testimonies from the Parochial Clergy of the Province of Canterbury; the Judges, Police Magistrates, Recorders, and Coroners of England and Wales; the Superintendents of Lunatic Asylums in England and Wales, &c., &c., on the Extent, the Causes, the Results, and the Remedies of Intemperance. London: Longman, Green, Reader, and Dyer.
7. *The National Association for Promoting Amendment in the Laws Relating to the Liquor-Traffic*. Prospectus.
8. *Central Association for Stopping the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday*. Third Annual Report. Manchester: Bancroft and Fleming, Market-street.
9. *Seventeenth Report of the Executive United Kingdom Alliance*. Manchester: Alliance Offices, 41, John Dalton-street.

A COMPREHENSIVE reform of the Liquor-licensing System has been long expected, and has not come at last, for Mr. Bruce, the Home Secretary, declines to bring in his Bill on the subject during the present session of Parliament. This fresh delay

is regretted by all parties concerned, not excepting the publicans.* The sword of Damocles, suspended so long by the thread of Government convenience, continues to be suspended. "We would it had fallen," say the publicans; for, although doubtless it would wound some of them, the rest, they fancy, would be delivered from their fears. Those, on the other hand, whose great concern is the welfare of the people, no less regret Mr. Bruce's abandonment of the intention to bring in his Licensing Bill, and will remark, with displeasure, that whilst he has allowed the liquor-traffic to slip again through his fingers, there remains on his hands the slime and disgrace of a promise deliberately and most publicly made, and yet not fulfilled. It may very reasonably be inquired, why should the measure have had awarded to it a paragraph in the Queen's Speech, at the opening of Parliament, only to be so soon abandoned? The plea of necessity will hardly avail here; since bills, not promised through the mouth of her Majesty, have been brought forward by the Government, and have added most inconveniently to the number and bulk of the "omnibuses" which Mr. Bright, prior to the outset of the session, forewarned us might block the way. Rightly viewed, we venture to affirm that the liquor-traffic question is not second in importance to any that is now engaging the attention of the Legislature. Whether in its politico-economical, or in its social, moral, and religious bearings, it yields to no other parliamentary question. A Government education scheme will scarcely benefit future generations more widely or more effectually than a well-devised reform of the licensing system; meanwhile, the latter would begin to tell on the "condition of England question" at once, and would lend to education the conditions without which it too often proves to be only a more costly preparation of victims for the Moloch of intemperance.† The pacifica-

* A special meeting of "the trade" of Bradford, held in May last, unanimously resolved: "That in the opinion of this meeting the delay on the part of the Government in bringing in a fair and comprehensive, and as far as may be a final measure of licensing reform, as the nation was led to anticipate from the Queen's Speech at the commencement of the last session of Parliament, is deeply to be regretted, in that it gives opportunities to private members to be continually attending reforms of the present system, and keeps the whole trade in a state of anxiety and suspense much to be regretted."

† Mr. Bartley, in his report to the Society of Arts, on *One Square Mile of London*, remarks: "The startling fact should be known that, if the inhabitants of this square mile, who are thought to be so very poor and helpless, were for one year to invest one penny out of every eight they now spend in drink, the £60,000 required for the school buildings would be raised by themselves. Not more than a third of this amount, or a penny in every twenty-eight, would amply keep the schools in order without any State aid or assistance from charity."

tion of Ireland is important, and the Government Land Measure will, we hope, contribute to that end; but every Saturday night proves that the pacification of England and Scotland is impossible so long as the liquor-traffic is allowed to inflame the passions and destroy the lives of the people. For every deed of agrarian outrage that makes our blood run cold, a hundred crimes, as cowardly and as sanguinary, are perpetrated in these kingdoms under the influence of intemperance, although, unhappily, the frequency and universality of its sad results prevent due recognition of their enormity. The causes and conditions of the commercial and industrial welfare of our country may be affected somewhat by one or another measure brought forward or favoured by the Government; a real reform of the licensing system, carried to its due extent, would touch all these for good with a hand unspeakably more influential. In truth, there is no question that can interest the philanthropist, there is no movement commending itself to the Christian heart, that is not prejudicially affected by the prevalence of intemperance, or that would not receive impulsion and furtherance from anything depriving the liquor-traffic of its blighting and paralysing power.

Mr. T. Paynter Allan, in his report to the same society, presents the following contrast :—

Comparison between the Sums Expended on Beer and on Education.

BEER.

	In the whole District.	Mortlake.	Richmond.	Twickenham.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Per the whole population	67,500 0 0	10,050 0 0	27,300 0 0	24,600 0 0
Per family	10 14 2	11 19 3½	10 13 0	10 5 0
Per head	2 2 10	2 7 10½	2 3 8	2 1 0
Population	31,510	4,200	12,500	12,000

EDUCATION.

	In the whole District.	Mortlake.	Richmond.	Twickenham.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Per the whole population	3,269 12 9½	492 4 4	1,744 5 7½	985 11 11
Per family	0 10 3½	0 11 8	0 12 3½	0 7 2½
Per head	0 2 0½	0 2 4	0 2 5½	0 1 5½
Population	31,510	4,200	12,500	12,000

It is only too easy a task to establish claims like these, by help of the abundant materials before us. Briefly let us look, first, at some of the financial bearings of the subject. Amongst the elements of the commercial and industrial prosperity of this country, the cotton manufacture forms no inconsiderable factor. With cotton are tied up the material interests of an immense population of cotton-lords, cotton-distributors, and cotton-labourers, especially in the North of England. A blight has rested on the trade for years past, and the favourite theory has been that the enhanced price of the raw material and the increase of factories abroad are shutting us out from the foreign market, and thus occasioning the heavy discouragement to which smokeless factory chimneys, and idle or half-idle machinery, bear melancholy witness. But what are the facts? A comparison of three of the best years the cotton trade ever had with three recent years of depression gives the following results:—

Exports of Cotton Manufactures of all Descriptions :

1859 ... 2,562,545,476 yards.	1866 ... 2,575,698,138 yards.
1860 ... 2,776,218,427 "	1867 ... 2,832,023,707 "
1861 ... 2,563,459,007 "	1868 ... 2,966,706,542 "
<hr/> 7,902,222,910	<hr/> 8,374,428,387

It is evident there has been no diminution of our foreign trade; this being so, where can the failure be, except in the home market? In a paper read before the Manchester Statistical Society, and quoted by Mr. Hoyle, Mr. Elijah Helm has shown that the value of cotton used for home consumption decreased by £3,466,000 in the three years 1866-7-8. In other words, our home trade, which should have been the chief support of our cotton interest, has fallen off 35 per cent. This argues either that the nation spends its money more on other things, and less on cotton than formerly, or that it has less money to spend. A glance at the consumption of intoxicating drinks will reveal the true explanation. During the years 1859-60-61 the money spent upon intoxicating drinks in the United Kingdom amounted, according to Mr. Hoyle's careful computations, to £252,217,124; but for the three years ending with 1868 it ascended to £304,039,333, being an increase of £51,882,209 on the three years, or of £17,274,069 per annum. Whilst thus we spent £304,039,333 on intoxicating drinks, we expended on the staple production, cotton, only £28,858,000. Assuming the population at thirty millions, this gives, for each man, woman, and child, for the

three years, £10 2s. 6d. for strong drink, and 19s. 6d. for cotton goods; or, taking the year 1868, the comparison gives £3 8s. 7½d. per head per annum for drink, and 4s. 7½d. for cotton. The present depression of the cotton manufacture is abundantly accounted for. Supposing that instead of one hundred millions per annum, our people spent one-fourth of this amount on drinks shown by the experience of many to be by no means necessities of life, and devoted the remainder—seventy-five million pounds sterling per annum—to the purchase of useful articles, what an enormous impetus to our trade would be imparted! The Caledonian distillery in Edinburgh manufactures from 800,000 bushels of grain 2,000,000 gallons of spirits per annum. The consumers of the article produced there part with at least £1,500,000 to obtain it. The Caledonian distillery employs 150 men in the manufacture; but the same sum of money spent on useful goods, or in draining waste lands, or building houses, would give employment to from 12,000 to 15,000 persons, or more. If the whole sum spent for spirituous drinks were appropriated wisely, it would find work for at least 1,200,000 more people than are now in employ. What a relief this would be to our alleged “surplus population!”

“Strange,” says Mr. Hoyle, “marvellously strange! that men of intelligence cannot see this. They go on forming emigration societies, sending our best workmen—who, above all others, should stay at home—out of the country, and housing in workhouses and gaols a whole host of paupers and criminals. If three-fourths of the money spent on intoxicating liquors were spent on clothing, furniture, and in the erection of houses, &c., it would find full employment for all our emigrants and able-bodied paupers, and besides this, pauperism itself, and crime, would fast disappear, and all those perplexing problems of our legislation, which are a disgrace to our Christianity and our civilisation, would be solved, and many of the evils which we have so bitterly to mourn would be eradicated.”

The expenditure of the United Kingdom, under the head of poors' rates and police rates, is set down at £37,108,827 for the three years 1866-7-8. During those three years we paid more in that expenditure by £8,000,000 than the whole value of our home consumption of cotton goods. Instead of thirty-seven, seventeen millions would have sufficed, had it not been for the crime and pauperism distinctly attributable to drink, and the other twenty millions would have been available for our home-trade. Again, in 1868, a total of 52,669,089 bushels of malt were used in brewing and distillation. If a bad harvest destroys 50,000,000 bushels of grain, food is made

dearer, and trade is depressed; can the result be different if food, which would have supplied every family in the United Kingdom with nearly four loaves per week throughout the year, is turned into drink at the expense of an untold amount of industry, thrift, sobriety, chastity, and every other virtue?

The manner in which the rich are becoming richer and the poor poorer, through the disastrous operation of the liquor-traffic, is clearly shown by Professor Kirk in his book on *Social Politics* just issued. The money is passing rapidly into few hands, chiefly through the agency of the liquor and tobacco trade. There were 21,008,684 gallons of British proof spirits consumed in the United Kingdom in 1868. Before selling this, the dealers must have added at least 7,002,878 gallons of water; because three "proof" gallons of whiskey will receive a gallon of water, and yet be strong when compared with the liquor sold to the masses at sixpence a "gill," and there are but forty-four glass "gills" in a gallon. The money paid for each gallon of diluted spirit must, therefore, be set down at twenty-two shillings; and thus it is shown that £90,922,663 were handed over to the ruling and liquor-vending classes in the year 1868 for spirits drunk by the people. To this must be added the malt-liquor bill, which Professor Kirk shows to have amounted to £93,467,854 in 1867. One large joint-stock brewery alone divides amongst its shareholders a yearly dividend as high as 30 per cent.; and Mr. Bass, the great Burton brewer, was stated by the Prime Minister, in the House of Commons, to receive profits equal to £1,000 a-day, Sundays included, throughout the entire year. Besides the British Spirit Bill, already alluded to, 4,312,857 gallons of rum were retained for home consumption in 1867, which would sell when diluted for £5,822,056; and in the same year, 3,183,093 gallons of brandy were the means of extracting £9,549,279 out of the pockets of the people, besides £1,137,250 spent for other foreign and colonial spirits. We have made no mention of cider, perry, and other alcoholic drinks, which are computed to abstract at least £1,500,000 yearly. These immense sums pass chiefly from the lower orders of society; and by far the largest part are ultimately netted by a small and already wealthy section of the people. The sum expended for alcoholic beverages, which, as we have seen, Mr. Hoyle computes as equivalent to £3 8s. 7½d. for each man, woman, and child, is estimated by Professor Kirk, when the cost of tobacco is added to it, as amounting to no less than £5 7s. per head per annum, after deducting a million from the population for the upper classes,

and leaving 29,000,000 as the lower; that is to say, a yearly expenditure of £26 15s. for each working-class family of five, or above ten shillings per week from every such family. Much of this money is spent, not to add to the industrial will and power of the purchaser, but seriously to abate from both. For example, a certain joiner's wages were examined for eight weeks before abstaining from drink, for eight weeks whilst abstaining, and for eight weeks after breaking his abstinence pledge, and the difference in the money he earned proved to be seven shillings per week in favour of abstinence. No wonder that the labouring classes, with their present drinking habits, find themselves so readily slipping down into pauperism. To this result, what Professor Kirk describes as "the swindle in money that is now associated with the liquor" most largely contributes. Even if the article were good and necessary, the proportion of duty and profit added to its prime cost before it reaches the consumer would make it ruinous whilst consumed so largely as it is, and render it not possible for the mass of the people to escape from the clutch of poverty. If oatmeal were dealt with in the same fashion, loaded with the same duty and profit, and bought with the same profusion, the result would be pauperising to the masses. That which now costs two-thirds of a penny in oatmeal would cost a shilling. The use of oatmeal would not cause a loss of work, and consequently of wages, as that of liquor does; and yet if each family of five on an average of the whole population paid more than £20 for about twenty-one shillings' worth of oatmeal, as they now do for alcoholic drinks and tobacco, the rich products of the earth, and of human skill, and the land itself, would go, not to them, but to those to whom they paid so lavishly for so little, and the poor creatures who gave the money, with their wives and children, would have, as Professor Kirk says, "to shift with the refuse, or die."

We must not enlarge upon this matter, threatening as it already does to fill all the space we have at command for allusion to the various evils, financial, industrial, social, moral, and religious, of which the liquor-traffic, which Mr. Bruce still declines to meddle with, is the prolific parent. What else we shall have space to say on these heads must be limited within the compass of a rapid notice of a very important and instructive report on the subject, lately prepared by a Committee of Convocation of the Established Church of England, and printed under the editorial care of the Venerable Archdeacon Sandford, who ably fulfilled

the duties of chairmanship. It rejoices us to know that while the attention of so many members of the Established Church is absorbed by considerations of clerical attire, of ritualistic tithing of anise and cummin, not a few, both of clergy and laity, have their eyes intently fixed on the wolf of intemperance that is decimating the flock. Pity, indeed, if men were so preoccupied with questions of colour and form of priestly vestments, that they could pass over as of little moment the rags and nakedness of the countless victims of the liquor-traffic. It were hard to believe that there were any who, infatuated about the burning of candles or the elevation of the wafer, should have no heart to care for the lights of intelligence which intemperance is continually quenching, or for the elevation of a drink-cursed people. One Committee of Convocation, at least, has been recently engaged in a most beneficial work. The Committee we now refer to undertook, under direction of the Lower House, to consider and report on the prevalence of intemperance, the evils which result therefrom, and the remedies which may be applied. In order that they might consider efficiently, they instituted, in the first instance, an inquiry extending to every part of the province of Canterbury, and not always stopping at its confines. The province itself includes thirty-two English counties, with North and South Wales superadded, inhabited by more than fourteen millions of people. The governors and chaplains of prisons, the heads of the constabulary throughout Great Britain, were consulted by letter; the superintendents of lunatic asylums in England and Wales, and the judges, recorders, coroners, and masters of work-houses throughout England were similarly communicated with; in addition to the parochial clergy of all the dioceses in the province, and through them, as far as possible, medical men and other qualified persons in their respective parishes. In short, the Committee sought to obtain the judgment of persons of intelligence and experience throughout the realm, as well as that of the clergy in the province; and to a very large extent their appeal was responded to, and the information they sought was plentifully supplied. The Committee next proceeded to consider and digest the knowledge thus obtained; and finally they prepared a report upon it. The names of the members of the Committee are sufficient guarantee for the value of the report. Amongst them were the Deans of Canterbury, Chichester, and Westminster; the Archdeacons of Coventry, Ely, Exeter, Leicester, Nottingham, and Salop; besides the prolocutor, seven canons, and

two prebendaries. The Archdeacon of Coventry was the chairman, and by his energetic care contributed very largely to the successful prosecution of the inquiry.

And what was the gist of the report brought in by these Church dignitaries? They found intemperance and its evils existing "to a frightful extent" in our commercial, manufacturing, and agricultural districts, as well as in the army and navy; beginning, "in many parts of the country," at the earliest age, numbering youths and even children among its victims; spreading, "in an alarming degree," amongst women also; and infecting at their sources the physical, moral, and spiritual life of the people. They found that "the multiplied and increased facilities for obtaining intoxicating liquor, provided by the law, are so many licensed temptations to the excess so frightfully prevalent and working such dire and disastrous results among our people." They impeached the present licensing system as "full of anomalies," noting that "no uniform rule is observed in its administration, that the restrictions intended by the law are continually set at nought, and that where violations of the law are shown to have taken place, convictions are of infrequent occurrence." They found, further, that a variety of trade and social usages contribute to swell the tide of intemperance which flows in constant stream from the public-houses. Turning to the results of intemperance, they reported these to be "of the most appalling description." To this cause, they say, "may be traced many of the crimes and miseries which disturb the peace of states and poison the happiness of families. While it depraves the character, impairs the strength, shatters the health and nerves, and brings thousands to an early death; it is found to fill our prisons, our workhouses, our lunatic asylums and penitentiaries, and, more than any other cause or complication of causes, to frustrate the efforts and baffle the hopes of all who have at heart the elevation and welfare of our people. We cannot spare room to reproduce here the long arraignment made by the Committee, with all its heavy and damning counts. No sacrifice, they declare, can be deemed too costly, nor any efforts too great, to check and remedy what may be shown by accumulated and undeniable evidence to be sapping the foundations of our prosperity, blighting the future, and lowering the reputation of our country, and destroying at once its physical strength, and its moral and religious life." Amongst the particulars cited are these:—that a Chairman of Quarter Sessions, in a recent charge, said it cost his petty

sessional division £20,000 a-year to maintain the public-house nurseries of crime; that at least 75 per cent. of the occupants of workhouses, and a large proportion of the recipients of out-relief, have become pensioners on the public, directly or indirectly, through drunkenness; that at least one day in six of productive labour in almost every department of trade throughout the kingdom is lost by the same cause; and this, with the derangement of many of our industrial operations, the imperfection of work, and the deterioration of strength and skill, raises the loss to one-sixth of the aggregate of our productive resources; that the annual expenditure of the British nation in intoxicating liquor is one hundred millions sterling, which, if capitalised for seven years, would more than avail to sweep off the national debt; that "a careful estimation of the mortality occasioned by intemperance in the United Kingdom, including the lives of innocent persons cut short by the drunkenness of others, places the mighty sacrifice at fifty thousand persons every year—a number thrice as great as that which perished on both sides upon the fatal field of Waterloo;" that in our naval and military services the loss through invaliding, casualties, deaths, and general inefficiency resulting from intemperance, is estimated "as at least one-sixth of their available strength: besides which, the imprisonments, discharges, and other punishments which acts of insubordination necessitate, are almost invariably to be traced to the same indulgence in intoxicating drinks;" and that the annual destruction of property and life through drink caused accident and shipwreck, which might otherwise have been avoided, is enormous. "No evil," the Committee say, "more nearly affects our national life and character; none more injuriously counteracts the spiritual work of the Church; and, therefore, no question more immediately demands the zeal of our clergy, the attention of our statesmen, the action of our Legislature, and the thoughtful aid of our philanthropists. Nor can any sacrifice be deemed too costly or any efforts too great to check and remedy what may be shown by accumulated and undeniable evidence to be sapping the foundations of our prosperity, blighting the future, and lowering the reputation of our country, and destroying at once its physical strength, and its moral and religious life."

Such being the character of the mischief unceasingly operative in our midst, it is not surprising that voice after voice should be heard invoking some remedy, that one association after another should advance proposals for abating the evil,

and that Mr. Bruce should have been driven to promise, as so many Home Secretaries in previous Ministries have promised, to do something to that end. The licensing laws, as they now exist, are susceptible, as everybody admits, of material alteration with obvious gain to the community. The statute empowering magistrates to grant certificates to authorise the Excise to confer the privilege of selling intoxicating liquors (known as 9 Geo. IV. c. 61) professed, in its preamble, to reduce into one Act the laws relating to the licensing by justices of the peace of persons keeping, or being about to keep, inns, ale-houses, and victualling houses to sell excisable liquors by retail, to be drunk or consumed on the premises. Upwards of twenty Acts were repealed by this statute. Under its provisions general licensing meetings of magistrates are annually held, and, at least, four other meetings every year for the transfer of licences. Certificates granted by the majority of the justices present authorise the Excise to issue licences for the sale of spirits and other excisable liquors on payment of the appointed fees. Houses for which licences are thus granted are allowed to be open for the sale of drinks, except on certain hours on Sundays, Christmas Day, and Good Friday, or any appointed fast or thanksgiving day. In 1830—two years afterwards—was passed the Beerhouses Act, in the hope that the increase of competition, in the sale of alcoholic drinks, would reduce the price of malt liquors, and, by encouraging the consumption of these, check at once the spirit trade and the intemperance of the people. It was hoped, at the same time, that the partisanship and jobbery alleged against the dispensers of the victuallers' certificates would receive similar discouragement. But no sooner had the new beerhouses come into activity, than the terrible nature of the mistake made became visible on all sides. In a few years the Act was slightly amended by limitations set on the rateable values, beneath which no beerhouses might be licensed, and by the requirement of certificates of character, signed by six persons, rated at £6 or upwards, in all places having a population less than 5,000. These amendments availed little. The beerhouses have continued to be almost unmitigated curses wherever established, notwithstanding the severer restrictions as to hours of sale which their holders are under as compared with licensed victuallers. In 1864 a permissive "Public House Closing Act" was passed, compelling all places for the sale of drink or refreshment to be closed for three hours, from one o'clock A.M. Most of the principal towns and other districts have adopted this Act. By

an Act passed in 1860, Mr. Gladstone enabled foreign wines, for consumption on the premises, to be sold in refreshment houses licensed thereunder, and gave power, at the same time, to grocers and other shopkeepers to sell such wines in bottles for consumption off the premises. Besides the retail licences granted under these Acts, wholesale licences are provided for; and under a recent statute wholesale dealers, on paying a small additional fee, may obtain retail licences for external consumption. Under cover of this extension, men unqualified to comply with the few requirements of the Beer Act have been enabled to enter and carry on the trade. Such, with a few exceptions, were the licensing laws applicable to England prior to last session. The exceptions included the ancient privilege, possessed still by "free vintners" of London, to sell wines without license; and the "occasional license," introduced by Mr. Gladstone, to promote the sale of excisable drinks at fairs, races, bazaars, cricket grounds, and other places of occasional public resort. In the last session of Parliament was passed the "Wine and Beerhouse Act, 1869," introduced into the House of Commons by Sir Selwin-Ibbetson. By this measure the command of beerhouse licensing was placed in the hands of the magistracy, who may now exercise over all applications for new beer and wine licenses the same discretional control as in the case of spirit licenses, with power to grant or refuse as they see fit. They can refuse their certificate if the applicant has failed to produce satisfactory evidence of good character; they can refuse it also when the house or shop sought to be licensed, or any adjacent house or shop owned or occupied by the applicant, is of disorderly character, or frequented by thieves, prostitutes, or persons of bad repute; or when the applicant has already forfeited a licence through misconduct, or been disqualified for holding one. In Bolton, Bradford, Halifax, Middlesborough, Manchester, Salford, Liverpool, and many other boroughs, and in some divisions of counties, a considerable reduction in the number of beer-licences has already been made; and a Bill to amend it in a still more restrictive sense is now passing through Parliament, under the care of Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, without any noteworthy opposition.

Having thus briefly referred to the licensing laws as they exist in England, we will allude, in the next place, to proposals for their further amendment now being advanced by associations organised for the purpose, or by other influential bodies.

The "National Association for Promoting Amendment in

the Laws relating to the Liquor-Traffic" is under the presidency of the Archbishop of York, and demands a restraining power, on the part of the people, on the issue of licences; the exercise of this power through licensing boards, to be elected annually by the ratepayers; a special and efficient system of inspection for the detection and punishment of all offences against the licensing laws, such as adulteration of drinks, gambling, permitting drunkenness or other disorderly conduct, and keeping open at unlawful hours; a return to the system of a uniform licence; the rendering of all connection, direct or indirect, between music halls, dancing saloons, &c., and public houses, illegal; and the shortening of the hours of sale on week day, and especially on Saturday nights, and on Sunday. This association assumes to be the exponent of the opinions of those who, feeling convinced that the excessive number of drinking-houses furnishes great facilities for intemperance, are in favour of progressive restriction. The president of its council is Mr. John Abel Smith. The Rev. H. T. Ellison, Vicar of Windsor, is chairman of its Executive Committee. Its honorary secretaries are the Rev. Thomas Rooke, H. C. Greenwood, Esq., and the Rev. Edward White.

The National Association for the Promotion of Social Science has always had the licensing system under its eye; as, indeed, was to be expected, considering how true is the remark of Mr. M. D. Hill, the late Recorder of Birmingham, that into whatever path the philanthropist may strike, the drink-demon starts up and blocks the way. Papers on the subject have been read at every meeting the National Social Science Association has held since its first congress at Birmingham, and resolutions have been frequently sent up to the Council for further deliberation. At the Manchester Congress in 1856, in the section devoted to matters appertaining to social economy and trade, one of the points expressly suggested for discussion by the Council of the Association was the question: "Upon what conditions, and by what authority, ought licences for the sale of alcoholic liquors to be granted?" At the request of the Council, papers in answer to this question were prepared by Mr. Samuel Pope and Mr. J. J. Stitt; and after the reading of these and others, and a vigorous discussion, the following resolution was carried almost unanimously:—

"That the necessities of the country call loudly upon the Legislature to pass a general measure to amend the laws regulating the sale of intoxicating liquors; this section would therefore respectfully request the General Council of the Association to consider the propriety of

memorialising Government to amend the licence laws, and to insert clauses in any measure enabling the inhabitants of townships and parishes to entirely prohibit the granting or renewing of licences whenever a large majority so desire."

During the discussion, the Rev. William Arthur, M.A., President of the Wesleyan Conference, made the following observations:—

"The most powerful, widely-extended, and the most prosperous of our institutions is the public-house. We are discussing a question which affects the welfare of every class of the community, not only at home, but abroad. I believe the English public-house is the most celebrated institution in Europe. There is not a sailor at Wapping, there is not a Turk comes to England by any accident, there is not a traveller from Mexico or Brazil who visits our shores, but he takes back with him the evil fame of the English public-house. I have seen a good deal of the world, and I have seen nothing so bad in it. . . . I feel it is wonderful to find that it is possible for a human being to doubt whether or not the sale of these things is an exceptional trade. Why, take it physically—are not its effects in the physical man exceptional? Take it socially—are not the effects in the family exceptional? Take it morally—are not its effects in vice exceptional? I take the opinion of Lord Brougham, as expressed to-day—that opinion which, I trust, will weigh very much upon the mind of the country—that drunkenness, so far from being any extenuation of a crime committed under its influence, is an aggravation of the crime. . . . For my part, I have no particular set of views on this subject; but I am ready to co-operate with those who hold the extreme views, or with those who go for the most moderate measures. I am ready to-day to co-operate with any man for the most moderate measures; and, rather than not co-operate with anybody, I am ready to co-operate with those who go immensely beyond what I could myself. I look upon the condition of our country as one so humiliating in this point of view that anything which stirs the public mind, anything which brings healthy intellect to bear upon it, such as is now at work in relation to it, must ultimately be a great blessing. As to the matter of liberty, I feel that requires very delicate handling; but, after all, if two-thirds of the parish think they would be better without the public-house, I don't think there is any great violation of liberty in leaving them in the situation to say to the other third, 'If you will have the public-house, you must go out of the parish for it.'"

Again, at the Belfast meeting in 1867, a special committee was appointed, which gave very careful consideration to the question, and presented a report to the Council of the Association, which that body, after much debating, adopted. At the Birmingham Congress, in 1868, the report was considered in the section for the Suppression of Crime, and the Council

was requested to press its consideration on the attention of Parliament. The suggestions made by the Committee included the following:—that every precaution should be taken to ascertain the character of all persons applying for licences, to see that the houses are of sufficient value, and proper for the business, and that the occupants have a reasonable likelihood of obtaining a living; that all applications for licences be made to the justices in the first instance, and that the justices have discretionary power over all sorts of licences; that the value of all new beerhouses be double that now required; that all licensed houses be closed on Sundays, except where justices see fit to let them be open from one to three and from eight to ten o'clock P.M.; that to *bonâ fide* inns a dispensation as to hours may be given by the justices, but not for any taproom, bar, or other place of public resort for drinking; that where application for a new licence is made, the justices shall refuse the licence if two-thirds of the owners or occupiers within five hundred yards object; that persons objecting to the granting of licences shall have right of appeal from petty to quarter sessions; that no clerk to the justices shall be permitted to apply for, support, or oppose any application for a licence; that when a person has had a licence granted for new premises, and sells these within three years for any valuable consideration, he shall be disqualified from holding a licence for other premises in the same county or place; that three convictions within two years for any offence shall disqualify for holding licence; and that the landlord of licensed premises shall be entitled to decline to serve any person whom he may consider to be the worse for liquor, disorderly, quarrelsome, or using obscene, disgusting, or profane language, and to call in the aid of the police to remove such persons from the premises.

A few sessions ago there was introduced into the House of Commons by the members for Liverpool, and by desire of the Licensed Victuallers' Association of that town, a Bill to which, although it met with little support in Parliament, probably more importance may attach than to some of the schemes we have been referring to, on account of the promise of Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Bruce that the provisions of the Liverpool Bill should not be overlooked in framing any measure to be brought forward with Ministerial sanction. By this Bill the promoters sought to secure uniformity in the issue of licences, with restrictions that should gradually lessen the number of houses, and diminish at once the hours of sale. These advantages were to be obtained by the immediate repeal of the

Excise licensing powers, and by making the magistrates the sole licensing authority. This authority was to be crippled by obliging the magistrates to grant licences whenever certain conditions were complied with by the applicants. To keep down the number of the houses, a high rental was to be rendered necessary, and a largely increased licence fee. Three-fourths of the inhabitants and owners of adjacent property were to be able, by their vote, to prevent the issue of new licences. To such publicans as would consent to keep their houses closed on Sundays, a reduction in the licence fee was to be made; and sundry increased restrictions were to be imposed upon the dealer in intoxicating drinks. Present holders of licences were to have fourteen years' grace before having to pay increased fees; but the police regulations imposed by the Bill were to come into operation on them all immediately.

The Committee of Convocation, of whose laborious inquiry we have briefly indicated the results in a previous page, did not conclude their task without recording various suggestions for the amendment of the licensing system which had been made to them by their influential correspondents in all parts of the kingdom. They have selected the following as most important. The division they adopt is into "non-legislative" and "legislative." In the former class they name the removal of benefit clubs from public-houses, and the holding of their meetings in schoolrooms, or, where obtainable, rooms specially provided for recreation and instruction; the discontinuance of the practice of paying wages or concluding bargains in public-houses, and the payment of wages on Friday, or early in the week, rather than on the Saturday, when there is more opportunity for drinking; the providing really good tea and coffee rooms, where wholesome refreshment and other comforts may be enjoyed by the working classes at a cheap rate; the encouragement of cottage allotments, night schools for adults, parochial libraries, workmen's clubs, and social gatherings, whether for mutual instruction or amusement; the provision of more comfortable, commodious, and healthy dwellings for working people;—

"Above all, there must be education in its widest sense and practical bearings, and based on Divine Revelation; which will implant principles and impart tastes that may serve to counteract and supersede the animal indulgence by which many are enslaved; and which ought to be supplemented, as far as possible, by special instruction on subjects bearing on domestic comfort and economy, on which points, it must be admitted, our national system of education has

been both inadequate and defective. What is required is an education, as described by one of our coroners, 'of a far more universal, more common-place, common-sense character than anything this country has yet seen.' One of the most thoughtful and sober writers of our day speaks scornfully of mere teaching as an 'empirical remedy' for intemperance. Another states, as a result of his pastoral experience, that some of the best educated are the most drunken. Even in highly civilised communities, intemperance has been found commensurate with temptations to drink. The only education that can cope with these is one that shall cultivate not only the mind but the heart, which shall embrace the encouragement by every proper means of a love of home and home enjoyments, as the natural and proper counteraction of the seductions of the public-house, and the general dissemination among the people of sound information as to the actual effects of our drinking habits upon their moral, social, and physical condition. In connection with such special teaching on the evils of intemperance, which the Committee are of opinion ought to form a branch of education in all our schools, temperance societies, bands of hope, and young men's associations are recommended by many of the clergy as having proved, in their experience, of signal benefit; and it is the almost universal testimony of those connected with our criminal jurisprudence and the control of workhouses, and, indeed, of all who have looked deeply into the subject, that in the case of persons addicted to intemperance, total abstinence from intoxicating drinks is, under God, the only effectual remedy."

But whilst thus suggesting various ameliorative measures, the Committee of Convocation add that they do not for a moment imagine that these of themselves would suffice to work a permanent cure. They state distinctly that they are convinced that without an improved and stringent system of legislation, and its strict enforcement, no effectual and permanent remedy for intemperance can be looked for; and they therefore feel it their duty to urge a series of changes in the law, including a great reduction in the number of public-houses throughout the kingdom, "it being in evidence that the number already licensed far exceeds any real demand, and that in proportion as facilities for drinking are reduced, intemperance with its manifold evils is restrained." Of their suggestions some are already embodied in the Act passed last session at the instance of Sir H. Selwin-Ibbetson; but the last, longest, and most important, has not yet been adopted by Parliament, although two divisions have been taken upon its second reading, and the second showed great advance upon the first.

"Your Committee," they say, "in conclusion, are of opinion that, as the ancient and avowed object of licensing the sale of intoxicating

liquors is to supply a supposed public want without detriment to the public welfare, a legal power of restraining the issue or renewal of licences should be placed in the hands of persons most deeply interested and affected, namely, the inhabitants themselves, who are entitled to protection from the injurious consequences of the present system. Such a power would, in effect, secure to the districts willing to exercise it the advantages now enjoyed by the numerous parishes in the province of Canterbury, where, according to reports furnished to your Committee, owing to the influence of the landowner, no sale of intoxicating liquors is licensed."

The reports here alluded to show that there are now within the province of Canterbury no fewer than fourteen hundred parishes and townships in which there is neither public-house nor beershop; and copious details are added, demonstrating the happy results of this immunity from the liquor-traffic.

In the recommendations of several of the associations already adverted to, the subject of Sunday closing finds a place. Indeed, that there ought to be some special restriction on the public-houses on Sundays, is a maxim generally acquiesced in. The sale of drink during the hours of Divine worship has long been ranked in England amongst things forbidden. The Long Parliament was severe upon tippling and Sabbath desecration; and under its care laws to that end were enforced, though not owing their origin in all cases to its initiative. The parish books of St. Giles', London, under date of 1641, testify that the landlord of the "Catt" was fined thirty shillings for permitting tippling in his house on the Lord's Day. If, bound up as it always is with vice and profligacy of every description, the liquor-traffic at the Restoration was released from some of its limitations and allowed new scope, the reign of Charles II. did not expire without a legislative act of remonstrance; the famous Lord's Day Act of 29 Charles II. c. 28 (1677) provided that "No tradesman, artificer, workman, labourer, or other person whatsoever, shall do or exercise any worldly labour, business, or work of their ordinary callings upon the Lord's Day, or any part thereof, works of necessity and charity alone excepted." Amongst works of necessity were expressly specified "the dressing and selling of meat in inns, cookshops, or victualling-houses, for such as otherwise cannot be provided;" but whilst the "*bonâ fide* traveller" was thus accommodated, the exemption could only by forcible and obvious twisting be made to cover provision for the indulgence of the mere tippler. Excepting that in 1782, by the 21 George III. c. 49, public-houses were prohibited to be used for Sunday

debates, nothing further appears to have been attempted by the Legislature in this direction until 1828, the date of the enactment of the "Act to Regulate the Granting of Licenses to Keepers of Inns, Alehouses, and Victualling-Houses in England"—an Act which we have already described as consolidating the previous licensing acts, and which required, in the schedule with the form of the licence, that the licensee "do not keep open his (or her) house except for the reception of travellers, nor permit nor suffer beer or other excisable liquor to be conveyed from or out of his (or her) premises during the usual hours of morning and afternoon Divine service in the church or chapel of the parish or place in which his (or her) house is situated, on Sunday, Good Friday, and Christmas Day." Eleven years afterwards a clause was inserted in the Metropolitan Police Bill (2 and 3 Vic. c. 47) ordaining that "No licensed victualler or other person shall open his house within the Metropolitan Police District for the sale of spirits, beer, or other fermented or distilled liquors on Sunday, Christmas Day, and Good Friday, before the hour of one in the afternoon, except for refreshment of travellers." To confer the same prohibitive boon on the City of London, a similar provision was made in the 2 and 3 Vic. c. 94, s. 26; and the sale of intoxicating liquors, up to one o'clock on Sunday, in river steamboats, &c., was strictly forbidden by the 5 and 6 Vic. c. 44, s. 5. The Town Councils of Liverpool, Manchester, and Newcastle-on-Tyne soon secured a similar provision in their local improvement acts, and a marked decrease of Sunday intemperance was manifested. In 1848, the Earl of Harrowby, in conjunction with Mr. Wilson Patten, agreed to bring the subject again before Parliament, and their Bill for regulating the sale of beer and other liquors on the Lord's Day (11 and 12 Vic. c. 49) received the royal assent in August of that year. It prohibited the sale of liquors before half-past twelve on Sunday morning, "or before the usual time of terminating worship in the principal place of worship of the parish or place;" it forbade the opening of any public-house or beershop for the sale of any article whatsoever except in the time of legal sale of liquor; it restricted coffee-shops from opening till five o'clock on Sunday morning; empowered constables to enter all drinking-shops whenever acting under superior orders, and inflicted a fine not exceeding £5 for each offence against the law, every separate act of sale being deemed a separate offence. This law effected marked improvement; and a Select Committee on public-houses, which sat in 1853, and

again in 1854, under the chairmanship of the Right Hon. C. P. Villiers, in its report stated that "It is important that those engaged in the trade should be made aware that there is a rapidly growing conviction abroad, and spreading even among all ranks, in favour of closing throughout the entire Sunday all places for the sale of intoxicating drinks;" and its recommendation "that with the exception of the hour of from one to two P.M., and of from six to nine P.M., all places for the sale of intoxicating liquors shall be closed on Sunday, and that on week-days all such houses shall be closed from eleven o'clock P.M. to four A.M.," was embodied, with some alterations for the worse, in an Act which, under the name of the Wilson Patten Act (17 and 18 Vic. c. 79), was passed in 1854. By an unfortunate concurrence of trickery with opportunity, the late Mr. H. Berkeley obtained the partial repeal of this Act in 1855, although its beneficial working had been abundantly proved; and since that year the drink-traffic in England and Wales has had eight-and-a-half hours during which to work its desecrating effects on every Sunday throughout the year. In 1853, Lord Kinnaird was the leading spirit in obtaining for Scotland what is called the Forbes Mackenzie Act (16 and 17 Vic. c. 67), which rendered all sale of liquor on Sunday illegal in Scotland; and a Royal Commission, which inquired into its operation in 1859, after examining nearly eight hundred witnesses, affirmed that signal benefits had accrued from that Act. With some slight alterations effected by the Act 25 and 26 Vic. c. 35, it has remained the law in Scotland to the present time. The effort to obtain a similar, if less extensive, boon for England has been maintained for some years past, and bills to that end were brought in by Mr. Somes in 1863 and 1864, and by Mr. J. A. Smith in 1867, but without success. In 1866, in October, a "Central Association for Stopping the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on the Sunday" was formed in Manchester; and this, by its energetic labours, has done much to mature public sentiment on the subject. The Central Association has its offices in Manchester and in London. Its president is Sir Thomas Barley, Bart., M.P.; Messrs. Robert Whitworth, Rev. P. A. Stowell, M.A., and Edward Whitwell, are its honorary secretaries. Under its auspices, Mr. Peter Rylands, M.P. for Warrington, has advanced the question of the entire Sunday closing of public-houses, by a motion in the House of Commons in 1869, and by a Bill introduced during the current session. The names of Mr. Birley and Mr. Osborn Morgan are also on the back of Mr. Ryland's Bill, which seeks to

extend to the whole of Sunday the present restrictions on the sale of beer and other fermented and distilled liquors. For many years past agitation for the Sunday closing of public-houses has been maintained by the British Temperance League, the oldest of all existing temperance societies in Great Britain, having its offices and executive committee at present, and for some time past, at Bolton, in Lancashire, and including a large number of minor temperance societies in its auxiliary and affiliated lists. We may add here, that a Sunday closing bill for Ireland, introduced by Major O'Reilly, was withdrawn last session, on the understanding that the Government would introduce a Sunday closing measure.

But we must not bring to a close our notice of the various law-amendment associations called into existence by the gigantic magnitude of the evils of the liquor-traffic, without mentioning a body which not only exceeds all the rest in the thoroughness of its demand for reform of the Licensing System, but has, by the boldness, comprehensiveness, persistency, and magnitude of its operations for the past seventeen years, awakened and intensified a public opinion without which the active existence of the others would have been altogether impossible. We refer to the United Kingdom Alliance for the Suppression of the Traffic in Intoxicating Liquors, formed in 1853, conducted by a general council of highly influential constituents, and an executive committee, with offices at 41, John Dalton-street, Manchester; and 28, King William-street, London, with Sir Walter C. Trevelyan, Bart., as its president; W. Harvey, Esq., J.P., of Salford, as its chairman of executive, and Samuel Pope, Esq., Q.C., Recorder of Bolton, as its honorary secretary. It communicates with its members and friends through the medium of the *Alliance News*, its weekly organ, and pursues its operations by help of a powerful staff of superintendent agents, who assist the formation of public opinion in their several districts, and by a large number of auxiliary associations, covering all parts of the three kingdoms. In the House of Commons it has secured a considerable body of supporters, who have rallied round Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Bart., M.P. for Carlisle, by whom the *Alliance* parliamentary attack on the liquor-traffic is led. In 1864, Sir Wilfrid obtained the votes of forty members for his Permissive Bill in the House of Commons; and in 1869, when he re-introduced his Bill, his supporters numbered ninety-four. In the former vote the House was against him by seven votes to one; in the latter, the majority was reduced to little more than two to one. The

Permissive Bill thus introduced by Sir Wilfrid Lawson seeks to confer upon the owners and occupiers of property in each district the power to veto the issue of licences for the common sale of intoxicating liquors wherever a majority of the rate-payers so determine. On the recent failure of Mr. Bruce to bring forward his promised measure of reform of the licensing system, Sir Wilfrid Lawson immediately gave notice that he would re-introduce his Bill; and the vote on its second reading will be taken early in July. To Sir Wilfrid's Bill, the United Kingdom Alliance lends its full support; but the "declaration" of its council, adopted on its inauguration in 1848, and still unswervingly adhered to, shows that the Alliance denies to the traffic in intoxicating beverages the right to exist, and seeks its entire suppression all over the three kingdoms. The following is a copy of this "declaration":—

"1. That it is neither right nor politic for the State to afford legal protection and sanction to any traffic or system that tends to increase crime, to waste the national resources, to corrupt the social habits, and to destroy the health and lives of the people.

"2. That the traffic in intoxicating liquors, as common beverages, is inimical to the true interests of individuals, and destructive of the order and welfare of society, and ought, therefore, to be prohibited.

"3. That the history and results of all past legislation in regard to the liquor-traffic abundantly prove that it is impossible satisfactorily to limit or regulate a system so essentially mischievous in its tendencies.

"4. That no considerations of private gain or public revenue can justify the upholding of a system so utterly wrong in principle, suicidal in policy, and disastrous in results, as the traffic in intoxicating liquors.

"5. That the legislative prohibition of the liquor-traffic is perfectly compatible with rational liberty and with all the claims of justice and legitimate commerce.

"6. That the legislative suppression of the liquor-traffic would be highly conducive to the development of a progressive civilisation.

"7. That rising above class, sectarian, or party considerations, all good citizens should combine to procure an enactment prohibiting the sale of intoxicating beverages as affording most efficient aid in removing the appalling evil of intemperance."

We have glanced thus briefly, yet, we trust, not altogether uselessly, at the great evil of intemperance from which all that is contributory to material, moral, and religious well-being suffers so grievously; at the existing licensing system under which this evil has attained its gigantic and monstrous enormity; at sundry organisations which have been formed

to check it; and at the various remedial proposals recommended by them to the attention of the Legislature. Amidst all these is rapidly interweaving itself, as more and more obviously and undeniably reasonable and necessary, the suggestion that however proper it may be to leave in the hands of justices of the peace the power of dealing with the yearly applications of candidates for liquor-licences, so far as concerns the character of the applicant, or the fitness of his house, the question as to the wants of the people should be left not to justices, who are a small and exceptional class, but, in fact, to the people themselves. If the inhabitants of a neighbourhood, in any visible majority, or even in any minority of not less than one-third, desire to have the liquor-traffic, with its invariable results, in their midst, to them let the decision be remitted, and on them let the consequences rest. But no small section of inhabitants, whether justices or brewers, should have the power of inflicting so serious an evil upon the rest. To this conclusion, we are convinced, the observant, reflecting, and well-disposed portion of the nation is every day coming with increased emphasis of conviction and declaration. And to this conclusion even the most careless of statesmen must arrive at last.

Every thoughtful observer of the House of Commons, and of its style of treating religious and social questions, must needs be satisfied that, so far as legislation can mitigate the frightful evils we have sketched, something of importance will soon be enacted. Our confidence is not based upon the promises of Government, or the energy of individual reformers, however energetic, or the constancy of the confederations mentioned above, but upon the strong, deep, irrepressible and always growing conviction of the people of this land that a Christian Government must come more vigorously to the help of public morality. The individual action of noble-minded and patriotic men, and the persistent agitation of the societies, are but the expression in various forms of the one public voice. Converging in so many various tones upon the Legislature, it must and will prevail—not, perhaps, precisely in the form that any individual social theorist might desire, but in some form that shall be effectual for the relief of the miseries to which we have referred. It is almost too late to express any good wishes for the good success of that instalment of the Great Reform which Sir Wilfrid's measure proposes; its fate will be settled by the time our remarks reach our hearers. All we can do, therefore, is most heartily to wish it success; and to indulge our hope that it is at this moment

enlisting the sympathies of many hesitating members of the House of Commons in its favour.

Turning for a moment from the Legislature to a still higher court—the final Court of Appeal—we cannot but express our conviction that the wide-spread agitation for measures to secure the better regulation or the suppression of the liquor-traffic, and the spread of the principles of temperance in our land, are watched by the Head of the Church, and the God of this realm, with approbation.

Whatever evils may be the concomitants of some of their workings, and whatever exaggerations may lower the efficiency of others, they are, in general, blessed of God, and deserve, even more than they receive it, the sympathy and good-will of men. No patriotic and Christian heart can fail to wish them success. Even those who do not join them, and dislike their operations, cannot but feel that their prosperity is, after all, identical with the well-being of society. We dare not except the last on our list—that honest, thorough-going, uncompromising society which would sweep the traffic away altogether. He who thinks it Quixotic and visionary—aiming at an object which is unreal, because so high as to be unattainable—must needs feel for its motive and efforts a profound respect. Nor can he deny that, failing of its highest aim, it accomplishes an amount of incidental good that can hardly be over-estimated. Keeping its eye on its perhaps unattainable goal, it gives a wholesome stimulant to the energies of those who aim at lower objects in the same direction. No statistics can tell the amount of good it has wrought. For it, and for every form of temperance organisation—from the oldest to the youngest—we have, notwithstanding some abatements, only one sentiment, that of cordial respect, and all but perfect sympathy.

In conclusion, we cannot but express our conviction that these societies and their restless agitations have, on the whole, a good effect on the great assault of evangelical preaching on the vice and sin of intemperance. We know that there are many who differ from us. There are those who point to the intemperate and extreme views of some of the agents of abstinence who have brought human systems into rivalry with the Gospel; in certain parts of the land it has been so, but by no means to the extent that is sometimes alleged. Some enthusiasts have erred deeply in this respect in times past; but, generally speaking, and as far as our observation extends, this mistake of the temperance movement is fast lessening towards extinction. Undoubtedly, the minds of many preachers of Christ's Gospel and of Christ's law have

been insensibly alienated from the subject in their public ministry; insensibly, we say, for no pastor of the Christian Church, worthy of his name or office, could wilfully neglect one of his great duties because others had thrown difficulties around his discharge of it. But, on the whole, we are persuaded that the pulpit's "reasoning on temperance" has been made much more vigorous, and pointed, and successful through the provocation of the outspoken and pertinacious societies that make intemperance their matter of never-weary protest. But that "reasoning" must be much more earnest than it is; and we believe it will be so, and that speedily. And we look forward with confidence to the advent of a better day, to be brought in not by legislation alone, but by legislation for the masses in conjunction with more earnest and plain preaching in the Church.

- ART. VI.—1. *A Bill to Amend the Law relating to the Occupation and the Ownership of Land in Ireland.*
2. *Reports from her Majesty's Representatives respecting the Tenure of Land in the Several Countries of Europe.* Two Parts. London: Harrison and Sons.
3. *Systems of Land Tenure in Various Countries.* A Series of Essays published under the Sanction of the Cobden Club. Second Edition. Macmillan and Co.
4. *Fortnightly Review* for June, 1870. London: Chapman and Hall.

SIR CHARLES DILKE mentions, in his *Greater Britain*, that the American Indians, against whom the Great Republic has for some years been waging war, cannot conceive the idea of a private ownership of land. They would as soon imagine a private ownership of the atmosphere. The ground they tread seems to them as incontestably the common property of all men as is the air they breathe. At the opposite extreme is the territorial magnate, who, looking forth from the windows of his mediæval castle, over garden and lawn, deer-park and wood, cannot understand how anyone can be so presumptuous as to question his right to do what he likes with his own. Acting on this principle, he has razed villages to make room for grazing grounds; he has evicted men from their homes to construct folds for sheep—or because they have obeyed the mandates of conscience in matters of politics or religion, he has turned out of their holdings the tenants, whose assiduous industry alone has given to the land the value it possesses. Between these two extremes stands the political economist. He shows, on the one hand, that the land is not like the air; for while the air needs no labour to make it serviceable to man, the land must be tilled; and that, if so, the cultivator must be encouraged to work by the certainty of enjoying the fruits of his toil. On the other hand, the political economist shows that property in land is valid only so far as the proprietor is its improver, and only on the condition that his proprietorship does not interfere with the public interest.

The first of these propositions has been so well understood in this country, that in order to protect the original cultivator, nothing less than a permanent tenure has been given him. The second proposition sounds like a revolutionary heresy, and would be indignantly denounced by politicians, and those

not exclusively of one party. And yet there is no "law" in any of the exact sciences so certain as this, that no man can have absolute possession of land. The ducal notions, current forty years ago, suffered a rude shock when Parliament first compelled landowners to sell their lands to railway companies. This was not even a case of the State claiming land for its own use. It was not that the State wanted the land to build a fortress for the protection of the country; in that case dukes, being nowise deficient in patriotism, might have yielded with a good grace. The transaction was a far more serious "invasion of the rights of property." It amounted to nothing less than this, that Parliament authorised a number of anonymous persons to take land held under a title as old as the Conquest, to cut through that land, to disfigure the most beautiful estate, and all in order that the Manchester or the Birmingham shopkeeper might get his goods from London a few hours earlier than before. It may be said that the landowner was compensated for the loss. He denied this. True, he was paid a price far beyond that which the land would have fetched in the market; true, "damages," outrageously large, were offered him, to the burdening of railway travellers through all time. But "nothing," he would say, "could compensate him" for the loss of his acres. He did not want money; the land he did want; yet the State deprived him of the second, and compelled him to accept the first. Thereby the principle of limited ownership in land was as firmly established as it would have been if only ten years' purchase had been given instead of the extravagant sum which was paid. If our readers still have any doubt on this point, let them ask themselves if the State would have had such power with regard to any other class of property. Could the State, for instance, seize or authorise any company to seize a man's jewels, or shares, or the balance at his banker's, and compel him to accept land or anything else in exchange? There cannot be any need of further proof of the doctrine that let a man's title to land be what the most cautious conveyancer would call absolutely indefeasible, he holds it subject to the will of the State, and is liable to be deprived of it, not only directly by the State for purposes of national defence, but by private individuals (with the approval of the State) for purposes of mere convenience.

But the political economist goes beyond this. Not only does he assert the right of the State to deprive the landowner of his land for the public welfare, but he denies that the

landowner has any valid title to the land, except in so far as he is its improver. These are the words of Mr. Mill, and he adds (*Principles of Political Economy*, Vol. I., p. 279, Third Edition): "Whenever, in any country, the proprietor, generally speaking, ceases to be the improver, political economy has nothing to say in defence of landed property as there established. In no sound theory of private property was it ever contemplated that the proprietor of land should be merely a sinecurist quartered on it." To most landowners this will be a hard saying, harder even than the first. Nevertheless, it is admitted in the great measure which is passing through Parliament at the present time. The main principle of that measure is that the landlord is not an absolute, uncontrolled owner of his estate; that the tenant, that is, the cultivator, has some share in it, and, although his share is small, the fact of his ownership is established. He has the right to enjoy, not only the fruits of his labour (in the shape of compensation for unexhausted improvements), but something more. He has the right to insist that if ejected from his tenancy without good cause, he shall receive additional compensation, in other words payment, for his interest in the land which he holds. There are signs that the principle laid down by Mr. Mill will receive wider application before long. The formidable increase of pauperism, and the disastrous extension of unwholesome speculation, have directed attention to the large amount of land in this country which is lying waste, which, though belonging legally to certain owners, is turned to no account by them. The heavy cost attending the acquisition of land has placed it beyond the reach of the middle class investor, who must have a fair rate of interest for his money. The same cause has often prevented the large landowner, who can afford to pay a fancy price for land, from expending a proper amount of capital upon it. The result is, that the middle class capitalist invests in wild schemes, which, after a time, collapse, and bring wide-spread ruin; and the labourer, who might be employed in cultivating the waste land, can get no employment, and is compelled to emigrate, if he would not become a pauper. Thus, at the same time, capital is driven from our country, and squandered on foreign and worthless enterprises, and the labourer, the back-bone of the country, as he has been called, is equally banished. "It would be difficult," Mr. Wren Hoskyns well says, "to paint the portrait of a folly more cruel and suicidal than that which, by a home-made obstruction, purely artificial and conventional, intercepts the inward flow of capital, and drives it

from our shores in pursuit of objects far more illusory and worthless than the conversion of the most impracticable moor or bog that ever was turned into an example-farm" (*Cobden Club Essays on Systems of Land Tenure*, p. 144).

It will be interesting at this time to inquire how far the principles of political economy have been accepted in other countries—to ascertain if the theories of the study have anywhere been accepted as practical facts. During the present year peculiar facilities for acquiring this information have been offered. The Cobden Club have published a volume of eight essays on the Systems of Land Tenure in Ireland, England, India, Holland, Prussia, France, Russia, and the United States, written respectively by Judge Longfield, Mr. Wren Hoskyns, M.P.; Mr. George Campbell, M. Emile de Laveleye, Mr. Morier, C.B.; Mr. Cliffe Leslie, Dr. Julius Faucher, and Mr. Fisher. A still more important contribution to the literature of the subject are the two volumes of blue-books, together containing over 900 pages, written by her Majesty's representatives abroad, respecting the tenure of land in the countries to which they are accredited. These reports are written by nearly sixty different persons, secretaries of legation, consuls, and other officials. They are of very varied value and literary merit. Some of the writers are accomplished men of letters, like Mr. Gifford Palgrave, the Arabian traveller, whose report deals with Eastern Turkey; like Mr. Robert Lytton, the poet, who writes respecting Austria; and like Mr. Finlay, the correspondent of the *Times* at Athens, who deals with Greece. Very different, too, is the amount of interest shown in their subject by the authors of these reports. On the one hand, Mr. Sidney Locock, the Secretary to the Legation at the Hague, thinks it necessary to apologise for having written as much as nine pages upon "so dry a subject" as land tenure. On the other hand, Mr. A. Michell writes an elaborate treatise of just 100 pages on the social condition of the Russian peasantry, and the effects of the great law of emancipation, which Mr. Hepworth Dixon has treated so slightly and unsatisfactorily in his *Free Russia*. But the prize for industry and thoroughness is carried off by Mr. Harriss-Gastrell, who has written no less than 243 pages upon the land system of Prussia. With pardonable pride, and yet in modest terms, he refers to his work, and, instead of asserting with Mr. Locock that brevity was essential on so "dry a theme," he speaks of the interest he has felt in it, and "begs leave to set forth his thankfulness that the tide of events brought to him the task which has

now reached its end." These reports and the Cobden Club Essays are only a portion of the literature on the subject, and we might enumerate a dozen, or even a score, of works which have been issued during the past twelve months, and which testify to the prominence that is now being given to a great social problem, hitherto—so far as Great Britain is concerned—scarcely propounded, much less solved.

In the circular which Lord Clarendon addressed to her Majesty's representatives abroad, he asked for information upon the following points:—The condition of the land and its owners where held by small proprietors; and where held by tenants and sub-tenants under landlords, the nature of the tenure, rent, evictions, improvements, and "miscellaneous." It would be impossible to compress within our limits information so multifarious, and occupying nearly one thousand large octavo pages; but we will endeavour to set before our readers the most interesting of the facts recorded, especially those which bear upon the land question in this kingdom.

The first fact which excites observation is the very general prevalence of peasant proprietorship throughout Europe. In Hamburg and Bremen, the land belongs to small proprietors who cultivate it; in Schleswig-Holstein, half the land is so held; in Saxe-Coburg, Würtemberg, Hesse, Bavaria, Sweden, the most prosperous provinces of Italy, and in Switzerland, small properties farmed by the proprietors are the rule. In France, says Mr. Sackville West, "the land is chiefly occupied by small proprietors, who form the great majority throughout the country. . . . With some rare exceptions, all the great properties have been gradually broken up, and even the first and second class properties (averaging 600 acres, and those averaging 60 acres) are now fast merging into the third (properties of six acres). To such an extent is this the case, that even at the present moment 75 per cent. of the agricultural labourers in many departments are proprietors." In Prussia, says Mr. Harriß-Gastrell, "tenants are the exception, large and small proprietors prevail." In Russia, which during the last ten years has been passing through a great social revolution, about 600,000 peasants have accepted, at the hands of their old lords, their homesteads and about three acres of land, as a settlement of all accounts between the two parties, while a much larger number, about three millions, male ex-serfs and the whole of the ex-Crown peasants (23,000,000), were, at the close of last year, perpetual tenants of homesteads and allotments of arable land. There is no country in Europe (Spain is not

included in either blue-book) where the land is so badly cultivated, and the cultivators of the land are in such a deplorable condition, as in Greece. In spite of the fertile soil and the splendid climate which, together, should make Greece one of the most productive countries in the world, barely one-seventh of the kingdom is actually under cultivation. During the dominion of the Turks few Christians possessed landed property; it was almost entirely engrossed by the ruling race. After the Greeks had achieved their independence, all the Turkish estates in the Morea, and in some other provinces, were confiscated, and became the property of the new State: in other provinces the Turks, being compelled to evacuate their estates, were allowed to sell them to Christians, but obtained very much below the real value of them. The new owners were a needy race, and the tenants have made a very poor exchange of landlords. The lands owned by the State occupy nearly three-fourths of the whole extent of territory suitable for cultivation. At different times it has been proposed to portion them out among the peasants, but the proposal has never been carried out. In 1836, a law was passed conferring, on each family of Hellenes, the right to purchase from the State, at public auction, thirty acres of land, and the State was authorised to grant to the head of each family a credit on the Treasury to the amount of 2,000 drachmas (£71 8s. 7d.); this sum to be reimbursed in thirty-six years at the rate of 6 per cent. interest and sinking fund. The measure proved a failure. The land put up to auction fetched such high prices, owing to local causes and the underhand proceedings of the authorities, that the purchasers have failed to meet their engagements. The arrears at the present time are about £3,500,000. In all probability the Government will have to write this large sum off as a bad debt; or, at the utmost, will obtain only so much of it as represents the value of the land forty years ago, which is very much lower than the price fixed at auction. Another expedient resorted to, for the development of agriculture, has met with no better success than the first. The Government authorised the National Bank to increase its capital by two million drachmas, on the condition that this amount was appropriated to loans to landed proprietors on their personal security. This condition has been evaded; for the small proprietors have little security to offer, consequently they have to pay from 12 to 18 per cent. for money. Few of the large proprietors live on their estates. Considering that agriculture is mean and degrading, they leave it to the peasants.

Even these do not love their work, and the peasant's son, despising his father's occupation, hopes to rise out of it. A Greek author, Apostolopulo, writing on agriculture in his country, says:—

“The Hellene wishes always to imitate his betters, and those who gain most. For this reason, we see crowds of learned men who gain barely the necessities of life; crowds of employes constantly being dismissed and loitering about; crowds of merchants, small tradesmen, money-lenders and usurers, and not a single educated and finished agriculturist capable of improving Greek agriculture. In Greece, all who come out of the high and low schools, all employ themselves with politics, and loiter about to learn the news; not one condescends to hold the plough, or to improve, scientifically, his property, because he considers this is the work of the ignoble peasant or labourer.”

One other great impediment to agriculture in Greece is the want of roads. That has for another of its consequences the plague of brigandage, culminating in that atrocious massacre which has lately thrilled Europe with horror, and which twenty years ago would have imperilled the very existence of the Greek kingdom.

We must pass from the extreme east to the extreme west of Europe for the next worst system of agriculture. Like Greece, Portugal is very imperfectly cultivated, and the cultivators are in a very miserable condition. There is one important difference between the two countries: while in Greece a large portion of the soil is held by the State, in Portugal it is held by the peasants, the average size of each cultivated property being only about eleven acres. In this country we find a remarkable exception to the general rule, that productiveness is in proportion to sub-division. Sparse as is its population, and fine as is its climate, Portugal does not raise nearly enough corn to supply its inhabitants. The vigour and the growth of the people are stunted by the insufficient supply of animal food. Potherbs, a little rice, chestnuts, beans, peas, and scanty rations of fish, constitute the main sustenance of the rural classes. Representing the proper mean daily ration of nitrogenous food by the figure 100, the Portuguese (taking into account all ages and both sexes) do not get more than 57, and the rural population get much less than this. While insufficiently nourished, and therefore unable to cultivate the soil with proper energy, the Portuguese peasant is burdened with a cruelly excessive taxation. Consul Brackenbury writes that—

“The state of the finances is deplorable. A constant and increasing

deficit, amounting now to more than a third of the revenue; an enormous floating debt, much of which has been raised, or renewed, on the most usurious terms; an expenditure which admits of no sensible reduction; an unelastic revenue, all attempts to augment which, in any proportion to the outgoings, have been frustrated by that 'ignorant impatience of taxation' which is developed in this more than in any other country in Europe; a system of taxes which is evaded systematically by the rich, and which presses with frightful severity upon the poor; such are some of the elements of that chronic financial crisis which is the curse of Portugal and the despair of her statesmen."

There is one district of Europe with respect to which the information supplied by these blue-books has greatly surprised us. If there is one region more than another which bears every mark of fertility and prosperity, it is that part of East Flanders known as the Pays de Waes. It is the most densely populated portion of Europe, and, though originally a sandy waste, it probably yields the largest produce. Everyone who has travelled by rail from Ghent to Antwerp will be ready to admit the faithfulness of M. de Laveleye's sketch in the Cobden Club Essays—"With an orchard in front, where the cows graze in the shade of the apple-trees, surrounded by well-kept hedges, the walls white-washed, doors and window-frames painted green, flowers behind the windows, the most perfect order everywhere; no manure lying about; the whole presents an appearance of neatness, and even of ease and comfort." It is the very opposite of the Tipperary cabin. Nevertheless the seemingly prosperous Fleming suffers from the same adverse influence as the squalid Irishman. Both are tenants at will; both are so closely wedded to their own countries that they will not leave them, and their intense competition for farms raises the rents in a manner ruinous to themselves. M. de Laveleye himself admits this in the paragraph next to that which we have just quoted. Mr. Hugh Wyndham, Secretary to the British Legation in Belgium, gives further particulars. He says that the peasant proprietor is almost unknown in the Pays de Waes. The farmers usually own only their cottages and buildings and a small piece of orchard. This possession is an absolute misfortune to the possessor. Not only has he to do all the repairs, but the landowners, knowing that he must have land to gain a livelihood, make what terms they please, and grant no lease. Close to Ghent the farmer owns no house, and there he can always secure a lease for three, six, or nine years. But in the Pays de Waes the agreement is made verbally for a term

of one year, which ceases on Christmas Eve. If he is to be evicted he has but short warning. Before sunset on December 23rd notice is served upon him. From that moment he must not set foot on the land. Consequently, if the piece of land which he is ordered to quit contains the root-crop for his cattle, and if he is unable to purchase fodder elsewhere, he is in all probability a ruined man. Such evictions are not uncommon. They are made in order to obtain higher rents, or (as in Portugal) through political motives at election times; or they occur through the death of the owner—a frequent event where the land is so subdivided that a farmer renting twelve acres will usually hold of several landlords. These reside chiefly in the large towns, and being less swayed by public opinion than their class is in England, they do not fear the reprobation of their neighbours if they resort to capricious evictions. A farmer may have as his landlords at the same time—

“A brewer, a grocer, a haberdasher, a manufacturer, a clockmaker, a publican, a farmer, a doctor, a lawyer, a parish-priest, a ‘liberal,’ and a ‘catholic.’ The brewer expects him to drink his beer; if he objects, he evicts him from the plot of land he holds of him, and lets it to a more profitable tenant; the grocer expects him to buy his coffee at his shop; his wife and daughters must dress well to please the haberdasher; he must purchase a watch and change it occasionally to please the watchmaker; he must assist the farmer landlord in getting in his crops before he attends to his own; if he or his family do not require the doctor’s attendance two or three times a year, the doctor seeks for a less healthy tenant.”

It is hardly less than miraculous that under such circumstances the farmer of the Waes country should be the most industrious, and, judged by the amount of produce he raises, the most successful in the world.

There are two countries of Europe which have passed through a revolution as regards the tenure of land during the present century. In both cases a great good was educed from a great disaster. In both cases an unsuccessful war, and the approach of the State to the very verge of ruin, compelled the enfranchisement of the land and the establishment of a peasant proprietary. The overthrow at Jena sealed the fate of the feudal system in Prussia; the capture of Sebastopol sealed the fate of serfage in Russia. The one event was followed by the royal rescript of October 9th, 1807; the other by the imperial edict of February 19th, 1861. The revolution in Prussia is usually associated with the names of Stein and Hardenberg; yet they were not the only actors in

it. The edict of 1807 was signed by King Friedrich Wilhelm III., by the two Schrötters, and by Stein. These, and also Auerswald, who had a share in framing the edict, owed their inspiration in no small measure to Adam Smith, whose doctrines, expounded by Kraus, they had been taught at Königsberg. The edict set forth that, "Whereas, owing to the universal character of the prevailing misery, it would surpass our means to relieve each person individually, . . . and whereas the existing restrictions, partly on the possession and enjoyment of landed property, partly in connection with the personal condition of the agricultural population, in an especial manner obstruct our benevolent intentions, and exercise a baneful influence, the one by diminishing the value of landed property and impairing the credit of the landed proprietor, the other by diminishing the value of labour; we are minded that both shall be restrained within the limits which the public welfare requires, and therefore we decree and ordain as follows." The main provisions were that every inhabitant was free, so far as the State was concerned, to buy what land he pleased. Every noble might exercise the calling of a burgher; every burgher might become a peasant—every peasant a burgher; property might be sold in block or piece-meal; leases might be granted; peasant holdings might be extinguished or consolidated; estates might be mortgaged; entails might be cut off; and villinage was abolished. This great measure was followed in 1811 by two decrees: the one removing all hindrances of the public law, and many hindrances of the private law, to the freest exchange of land, and dealt tentatively with the rights of common; the other invested all peasant farmers and peasant landowners with absolute property, and commuted all mutual rights and obligations of lord and peasant. After the emergency which led to this great change had passed away, and the battle of Jena had been followed by the entrance of the Allies into Paris, the desire to carry out this reform in great measure ceased. Stein, as Mr. Morier remarks in his *Essay on the System of Land Tenure in Prussia*, published in the Cobden Club volume, "belonging to the class of statesmen to whom recourse is instinctively had in times of trouble, and from whom men who desire a quiet life, and who consider that 'sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof,' instinctively shrink when the storm has passed by, he did not return to office when the French were driven from the soil of Germany." The year 1816 saw a reactionary measure passed into law, which restricted the operation of the edicts of 1809 and 1811. The new act excluded from the benefits of the old acts all

peasant holders of land who were not assessed to the land-tax, who did not possess team-requiring farms, who had not been settled on the land since the middle of the previous century, and whose land was not subject to the obligation of being occupied by peasants. The "so-called small folk," for whose especial benefit the edict of 1809 had been proclaimed, were now excluded, and continued so until a new upheaving of society, the Revolution of 1848, brought about a fresh change, and led to the legislation of 1850. By this event all hereditary holders of land, irrespectively of the size of their holdings, became absolute owners, subject to certain dues and services to the old lords, which, however, were commuted into fixed money rents. These were subsequently made compulsorily redeemable, either by the immediate payment of a capital equivalent to an 18 years' purchase of the rent-charge, or by a payment of $4\frac{1}{2}$ or 5 per cent. for $56\frac{1}{4}$ or $41\frac{1}{4}$ years on a capital equivalent to 20 years' purchase of the rent-charge. At the same time the State established rent-banks, and so constituted itself the broker between the peasants by whom the rents had to be paid and the landlords who had to receive them. The results of this legislation are eloquently described by Mr. Harriss-Gastrell. The peasant farmers have been invested with absolute property in their lands. All peasants have for more than sixty years ceased to be serfs, and most of them have profited by a commutation of the sums due to the old lords in compensation for the loss of personal service. The hindrances to individual activity, especially those arising from the rights of common, have been removed, and, as Mr. Morier has shown, the amount of live stock has increased enormously, at the same time that the amount of arable land has not diminished. The national strength has been enormously fortified and the national wealth immensely increased by the freedom given to labour. For instance, the abolition of forced labour released the peasants from $5\frac{1}{2}$ millions of days of hand-labour, and $21\frac{1}{2}$ millions of days of team-labour. Dr. Meitzen estimates the waste of labour under the old system at £750,000 a year. The commutation of real charges and services has caused a sum of £28,500,000 to pass from the peasants to the lords. The extinction of rights of common affected a half of the area of the kingdom. Wasteful subdivision has to a great extent ceased. The land improvements of the last twenty years have affected an area of 2,000,000 acres at an average cost of £1 4s. 6d. an acre. The establishment of agricultural academies and associations is another of the good results of the land legislation. Fifty years sufficed

to effect in Prussia changes which in England have been going on for six centuries, and which are not completed yet.

Russian serfage dates from the year 1592. Gradual alterations had been made for some time previously in the political status of the peasants, the true meaning of which the persons affected did not comprehend. The proclamation of the usurping minister, Boris Godsmow, forbidding the Russian peasant to quit his village without permission and a passport, opened the eyes of the people to their condition, and popular poetry has kept alive to the present time the memory of that miserable St. George's Day. Strange to say, England was indirectly the cause of this cruel enactment. Between England and Russia at this time there was a somewhat close alliance, and Ivan the Terrible had even sued for the hand of Queen Elizabeth. Mikulin, the Russian ambassador in England (the one who took part in quelling the insurrection of the Earl of Essex), had to report to the Czar on English legislative institutions. By a statute of the 14th of Elizabeth it had been ordained that the abode of paupers and vagabonds was to be fixed in the parish in which they had been born, or in which they had lived a certain time.

"Might not Boris Godsmow (says Professor Faucher, *Cobden Essays*, p. 376), whose legislative acts in the matter date from 1592, 1597, 1601, and 1606, beleaguered by his nobility, and getting the convenient pretext of a famine (which broke out engendering swarms of beggars, and a typhus epidemic which these beggars carried all over the country), and informed by his ambassadors of the wise counsel under similar circumstances of the advisers of the English Queen, have tried a Muscovite version of contemporaneous English legislation? Indeed it looks very much like it. Proneness to imitation and reckless boldness in trying it is a Russian characteristic to this day."

The first result of the ukase of 1592 was an almost entire stop put to colonisation. This by itself was a great disaster in a country where vast tracts of land were wholly uninhabited. The harmless but enterprising villagers, who had conquered the uncongenial eastern plain of Europe for civilisation, disappear from this time, and their place is taken by mere tools, *mujiks*, i.e. bodies, *tchornoi narod*, i.e. black people. They were, in fact, looked upon in very much the same fashion as the "damned nigger" of English-conquered countries. They were bought and sold with the land; without the land they were merely let out, and were fortunate when let out to themselves. The Emperor Nicholas attempted to ameliorate the condition of the serfs, and a ukase abolishing serfage was actually drawn up, when the French Revolution

of 1830 caused him to abandon his design. It needed the lesson of the stern teacher adversity—the lesson which he lost his life in learning—to bring about complete emancipation. It is supposed that when, dying of a broken heart, Nicholas sent for his successor, he charged him to abandon the policy which had brought the empire to the verge of ruin. Certainly, whatever Alexander's conduct may have been towards Poland (and there are two sides to that story, even), the reigning Czar has shown himself a wise and enlightened prince. The Emancipation Act of 1861 directly affected only the serf population of Russia Proper, or the peasantry attached to the lands of the aristocracy and the gentry (22,000,000); but indirectly it affected also the peasantry of the Crown (23,000,000) and of the appanages (3,000,000). The last two became the subjects of special legislation, which was the logical result of the first Act. The number of proprietors who owned serfs in Russia Proper was 103,158. 23 per cent. of these owned more than 100 male serfs; 41½ per cent. held not more than 21; and 35½ per cent. between 21 and 100. The area of land in the possession of these proprietors was 301,000,000 acres, and 100,000,000 of this acreage was held by the serfs either at a rent in money or service, or under a mixed liability both in money and service.

"Each male serf, therefore, engaged the usufruct of about ten acres of land. The quit-rents levied by the lords varied greatly in the provinces, less in proportion to the productiveness of the soil and the income of the serf than to the necessities of the landed proprietor, who could afford to claim less rent if he possessed a more than average number of serfs. When in want of funds, the lord had recourse to a loan, which he readily obtained from the State, on the mortgage of his serfs and lands. In such cases it often happened that the extra charge of interest and sinking fund was added to the serf's quit-rent, who thus actually suffered a money loss for being mortgaged on account of his lord's pressing necessities."—*Mr. Michell's Report on Land Tenure in Russia (Blue Book, Part II. p. 26.)*

It was ascertained that the mean rate of quit-rent levied from the serfs in money, where they rendered no service, was about 2s. 3d. an acre, and in the industrial provinces 2s. 9d. Where the payments were made in service, they were much higher. Mr. Michell states that in some of the industrial provinces, where the peasantry had grown rich, the quit-rent was sometimes as much as £5. In carrying out emancipation the question arose as to whether the serf should be freed with or without an expropriation of land in his favour. The first idea of the Government and the nobles was that the emanci-

pated serf should be assisted by the State in the purchase of his homestead, and that the rest of the land, whereof he had been enjoying the usufruct, should be left in his tenancy for a term of from nine to twelve years at a rent to be determined by law, and at the end of that term the rent should be fixed by mutual agreement. The Liberal party in Russia strongly objected to this arrangement. It would, they said, be the converting of the serf into a pauper. Eventually, the landowners, foreseeing that if they did not assist the emancipated serf to buy his land, they would lose both the land and the value of it, suggested a voluntary redemption, which would bring them in a large sum of money, most useful to the many of them who were deeply mortgaged. A compromise was effected with the ultra-Liberals, who, at last, accepted the conditions upon which the Emancipation Act was subsequently based. These were—1st. The cession of the perpetual usufruct (tenancy) of the serf's homestead, and of certain allotments of land on terms settled by mutual agreement, or failing which, on conditions fixed by law. 2nd. The compulsory sale by the lord, at the desire of the serf, of the serf's homestead, either on terms of mutual agreement, or on conditions fixed by law, the right of refusing to sell the homestead without the statute land allotment being reserved to the lord. 3rd. State assistance in the redemption (purchase) by the serf of his homestead and territorial allotment, provided the lord shall agree to sell the latter. In this way the serf became a freeman, obtained the right of enjoying on terms fixed by law the perpetual usufruct of his homestead, and of certain allotments which he had cultivated; the right of converting his liability in service (socage) into a money-rent, the means of terminating his relations of dependence towards the lord of the soil; and communal and cantonal self-government. The advantages were not all on one side. The lord ceased to be responsible for the care of the poor, or for the payment of the imperial taxes of the peasantry; he was no longer bound to defend actions at law in which his peasantry became engaged; he obtained compensation for the loss of serf-labour and the cession of lands, and he obtained the means of clearing off mortgages and buying agricultural machinery.

It is not easy as yet to estimate the results of this great social revolution. It has been accompanied by another, and the action of the first has been greatly modified by the action of the second. Up to 1861, and for some years since, communism has prevailed in the rural districts, that is, throughout nearly the whole of Russia. The unit of Russian popula-

tion was not the individual, not even the family, but the village. The inhabitants of a village held land and labour in common. Common labour had cleared the forest and built the block houses. The enclosed space of the village street was, in summer, the common workshop for carpentering and preparing the hemp and the flax, and for bleaching the cloth. This principle extended beyond the village. If the son of a village having been permitted to make a pilgrimage, or to go to court, had during his journey found means of acquiring gain by trading, he was not to reap the benefit solely, for he could not have made his journey if his village had not been a common household. Thus, whoever got orders abroad for the articles produced by the house-industry of his village, did not get these orders for himself as a speculator and an employer of labour, but for the village as a whole, and the orders were distributed among the villagers by common consent. This system, which realised some modern philosophic dreams, had many evil consequences. The *starosta* (elder) of the village was a despot, and so, too, was the head of each family. The one strengthened and confirmed the other in his despotism. It was manifested especially in the marriage of the children. They were married without being consulted in the smallest degree. A father would look out for a woman with a small dowry, whereby he, as head of the family, would be the first to benefit. Generally, his daughter-in-law elect would be several years older than his son, and if the father was a widower, he would not seldom commit the sin of incest. The first effect of emancipation was the throwing off the yoke of the elder. A subdivision of families soon followed, and, although checked by the Central Government, it still continues:—

“In every village throughout Russia,” says Mr. Michell, “the observation may be heard that ‘Now each is for himself;’ that families no longer live in harmony, and that the women of a household quarrel over their respective shares of work, as well as over the proportion of the common earnings to which they are severally entitled. Fathers and sons have very generally dissolved a partnership in which the father alone was purse-bearer. Brothers have divided the common stock of oxen, sheep, horses, and implements, and commenced life with a new energy, building their own cottages, and tilling their own allotments; each working for himself, his wife, and little ones. Even the women of a peasant family now insist upon spending on themselves entirely their earnings, or the produce of their spindles and looms. The young have ceased to yield implicit obedience to the old, since the law recognises no distinction in age,

and gives equal rights and privileges in respect to land to all males registered at the same census."—*Blue Book*, Part II. p. 32.

The change has also checked the nomadic tendency of the Russian peasantry. Formerly they knew that, however long they were absent from their families, these would be maintained by the village. They can no longer depend upon this, and are, therefore, forced to give up that perpetual pious vagabondage called pilgrimages in which they used to indulge. The Government, while it has never interfered with this, has always discouraged, and still discourages, the removal of peasants from one commune to another. They have to fulfil various onerous conditions before they can obtain permission to emigrate; and, as the amount of common land in every commune is fixed, it is not the interest of any commune to receive new inhabitants, and so the new comer is almost compelled to purchase a freehold. There is, however, a middle course between compulsory perpetual tenancy, and almost equally compulsory purchase. It consists in accepting, at the hands of the lord, a quarter of the maximum land allotment, inclusive of the peasant's homestead, as free gifts, given by the lord, and accepted by the peasant as a settlement of all claims, and a rupture of all compulsory relations between them. About 600,000 peasants have accepted these terms, and become proprietors of their homesteads and about three acres of arable land. Another effect of the Emancipation Act has been the introduction of agricultural machinery. The lord being no longer able to command the services of the peasant at sowing and reaping, is compelled to call in mechanical aid. There is no doubt that, at first, the landowners suffered severely by the Emancipation Act. Many of them had lived most extravagantly, spending the whole of their revenues abroad, and deeply mortgaging their estates. Suddenly they found themselves with empty coffers and unsaleable estates; they had no money, and they had no means of raising it. At the same time, they found that their political influence was destroyed. Labour was scarcely to be obtained; the peasants were distrustful of their former masters; for holding that the land was their own, even though their persons belonged to the lords, they misunderstood the object of the Emancipation Act, and some serious risings took place. The Polish Insurrection, however, reconciled the antagonistic parties, knit them together, and gave the Government a strength and an impetus which it has not since lost. The condition of affairs was improved by the Act of 1865, which

gave to the peasants a right to participation in all affairs relating to the domestic welfare and requirements of each province. Nevertheless, Mr. Michell considers (and there is no one better qualified to speak) that, so great were the imperfections of the Emancipation Act, it is rather in spite than in consequence of this Act that the condition of Russia has improved. The army has been remodelled, an iron-clad navy has been built, a net-work of railways has been thrown over the country, open courts of law and trial by jury have been established, and all these changes have been brought about in the midst of great financial pressure, and in the midst of serious political disturbances. Defects have been discovered in the Emancipation Act more than sufficient to account for the slow progress towards prosperity which has been made—slow, that is, as compared with what should have been made after such changes. Russia has yet many other steps to take in the path of political freedom, and every step that is taken will bring her nearer to prosperity. "In the meanwhile," concludes Mr. Michell, "the past experience of Russia, in regard to land-legislation, would seem to afford a practical lesson of the injuriousness of laws intended to stimulate, artificially, the formation of a class of small proprietors, and the attachment of a peasantry to the soil."

Prussia and Russia are not the only countries in Europe which have undergone a revolution in the land-tenure during the present century. Austria has passed through a similar change. Mr. Robert Lytton (known in the literary world as "Owen Meredith") has described very briefly the course of events in that empire:—

"The land-laws of 1848-9 abolished the feudal system in Austria with all its privileges, exemptions, and monopolies. The Austrian peasant was, thereby, converted from a serf into a peasant-proprietor; that is to say, the conditions of forced service and feudal impost under which he previously held the land allotted to him were then removed, and he was invested by the State with the free and unconditional ownership of it. The manner in which this change was effected was by compensation from the State to the great proprietors for the pecuniary value of the feudal rights of which the State then deprived them."—*Blue Book*, Part II. p. 9.

The arrangement was carried out by the appointment of a Commission which estimated the value of the feudal rights enjoyed by each proprietor. From this total estimate the Government deducted one-third, which was cancelled. The State undertook to pay in 5 per cent. bonds the remaining two-thirds. For this purpose it was necessary to provide not only 5 per

cent. interest, but a sinking fund for redeeming the debt in forty years. One-third (that is one-half of the two remaining thirds) is provided for by a tax levied exclusively on the new peasant-proprietors, and is regarded as the price payable by them to the State for the immense advantage which they have derived from the legislation of 1848. The remaining one-third is assessed as a sur-tax on the local taxation of each province. The result is, that of the total compensation assigned by the Commissioners to the great proprietors, one-third has been altogether disallowed by the State, and one of the remaining two-thirds is raised by a tax levied upon the great proprietors themselves. They have, not unnaturally, complained of this. Yet, though at first they were brought to the very verge of ruin, all the more because the change was accompanied by so much political and social disturbance that it assumed the character of a civil war, the proprietors now admit that they have greatly benefited. In order to escape ruin they have been compelled to cultivate their estates scientifically, and have imported machinery to a large extent. Many of them have doubled, and some have trebled, their incomes since 1848, and the average market price of land has risen a hundred per cent., and in some provinces even more. At the same time the improved condition of the peasants is conspicuous. They were, indeed, proprietors before; but they were feudal proprietors: owners of the land they cultivated, yet bondsmen of the great landlords. They have now become free proprietors, having possession not only of their land, but also of their persons and labour.

It will be interesting to turn from the old continent to the new—from Europe, with its old-world traditions, and its burdensome inheritance from feudal times, and its densely populated area—to America, with its new life, boundless territory, and perfect freedom. The agricultural area of the United States, in 1860, was 163,110,720 acres of improved land, and 244,101,818 acres of land unimproved. In other words, there were for every two acres of improved land three acres connected therewith not under cultivation. The gross aggregate of uncultivated territory was 1,466,969,862 acres. The population is at the present time estimated at over 42,000,000. Thus there are about ten acres of cultivable land for every man, woman, and child in the States. With such a vast amount of land to till, and so few to till it, land must necessarily be cheap and labour dear. These two facts govern the tenure. Men will not readily work on other persons' estates when they have the power of purchasing estates for

themselves. So we find that, whereas in countries like England there will be twenty labourers for one farmer, in the United States the farmers far outnumber the labourers. In Texas, the first are more than eight times as numerous as the second; in Nebraska Territory nine times; even in densely peopled New York State they are more than two to one. And it must be remembered that the American "farmer" is not a mere tenant-farmer, as he is for the most part in England, but he is generally his own landlord. The Irish emigrant, though almost penniless, will often arrange for the purchase on time of a lot of land. He will then work as a labourer until he has got together a few dollars to purchase implements, seed, and a little food—that is, a barrel of flour, some salt-pork, and some tea. This will last him for one season. He will then struggle on until a succession of harvests finds him a rich man in comparison with his former condition. The feeling of "becoming one's own landlord" does, says Mr. Fisher (himself an American), the author of the Cobden Club Essay on *Land Tenure in the United States*, act as a strong incentive to industry. By a recent Act of Congress, known as the Free Homestead Law, every citizen of the United States, or any foreigner who shall declare his intention of becoming a citizen, can have a farm of 160 acres without charge. It would be well if the Irish always took advantage of the facility thus offered them. Unfortunately, as Mr. Thornton, our Minister at Washington, says, "the majority of the Irish remain in the large towns, where, with rare exceptions, they do little good for themselves, are unthrift, quarrelsome, and intemperate." This state of things—which, we must remark in passing, differs widely from the account given by Mr. Maguire, M.P., in his book on the *Irish in America*—is the more to be regretted because, as Mr. Thornton adds, "where single families devote themselves to agriculture, and are able to purchase the land which they cultivate, they at once take so great an interest in what they can call their own, that their character is entirely changed, and they become thrifty, orderly, and useful citizens, and acquire a great respect for the rights of property."

Though the farmer is generally the owner of the land he cultivates, this is not an invariable rule. In Massachusetts farms of various sizes are rented, varying from 30 to 500 acres, and are let in shares. In California farms of from 80 to 8,000 acres are let; but no lease can be granted for more than ten years. The New York Legislature, in 1846, abolished all feudal tenures and fines, and forbade leases of

longer than twelve years' duration. In Michigan the same limit was provided. In Pennsylvania a lease exceeding three years must be in writing. Rent is paid in money or in shares of the produce. In Virginia it is customary to let a farm on the condition that the landlord receives as rent two-fifths of the agricultural produce, such as grain and hay, and half of the fruit, poultry, and produce of live stock: the tenant takes the remainder, works the farm, and finds his own implements. Evictions are of very rare occurrence, and are generally caused by default of rent. Permanent repairs are usually made by the landlord. The law recognises no right in the tenant to any improvement made except under covenant in his lease. The sale of land is effected as easily as the sale of a watch. Mr. Ford, of the British Legation at Washington, gives the following account of a transfer of property which will make English readers envious of their Transatlantic cousins:—

“An instance could be cited of an estate (in one of the Western States) that consisted of real property worth more than 1,000,000 dollars (£206,612), and personal property valued at 400,000 dollars (£82,644), which was left by the testator to his children; his son and son-in-law were the executors. Within three months after his death, the property, real and personal, was divided among his heirs, each entering into full possession of his share, all the necessary legal formalities were fulfilled, and the whole expense of probate and other fees, cost of registering and engrossing the several deeds of partition, and all other papers, and every expense, did not exceed the sum of 150 dollars (£22 10s.). Of course, probate and succession duties are not included. They are new in this country, and rank as unfortunate legacies of the late war; nor can their continuance be looked upon as permanent in a country where the policy obtains of paying off, as speedily as possible, the national debt.”—*Blue Book*, Part I. p. 486.

American agriculture is necessarily very varied. As compared with the European standard it is very defective. That it is so is due rather to the fertility and the wide extent of the soil, than to any ignorance or indolence on the part of the cultivators. In a country like the United States, the farmers do not find it worth while to prolong the productiveness of their fields, either by rotation of crops or by the use of fertilisers. The gradual shifting westward of the centre of the wheat-growing region is a striking proof of the rapid abandonment of old soils for new ones. The Western States are the granary not only of America, but of England. Of late years California has become a wheat-growing state. In 1854 no wheat was produced there at all; but now California

not only supplies its own needs, but is become a large wheat-exporting state. Cotton requires much more care than wheat. A thorough preparation of the land by deep and close ploughing is essential to the production of a good crop. As the first frost would kill the cotton ball, great care has to be taken not to sow too soon, or to develop the plant too rapidly. Even when the plant is fully up it requires constant ploughing and hoeing. The white labourers have yet to learn their work, and will take some years to acquire the skill which the negroes had attained. The great needs of the Southern States are capital, labour, machinery, and an improved process of culture. The prospects of these states are now described by Mr. Ford as being very promising.

Before passing to the country which has been rendered so prominent this year by Mr. Gladstone's great measure, there is one question which it is desirable to answer. Does fixity of tenure exist in any country, and if so, what are its effects? We have seen that in Prussia, Russia, and Austria, the peasant has been converted into a proprietor of the land which he cultivated. But there are countries in which fixity of tenure is not the result of any recent legislation, but has been in existence for centuries. In Portugal, the tenure called *Emphyteutas* largely prevails. The term is of Greek origin, and is derived from *Ἐμφύτευσις*, engrafting or planting. This tenure resembles the copyholds of England in that the rent is fixed and the tenant irremovable. It dates from the Roman Conquest. The Romans, on subduing a country, sometimes left the land in the possession of the inhabitants, who paid a fixed rent or *sectigal* to the State. Leases were granted at first, but it became necessary in order to encourage cultivation and to give him greater security. By degrees his improvements were secured to him, then he was guaranteed against eviction and increase of rent; and, finally, he obtained full power to dispose of the land which remained, subject to the quit-rent, in whatever hands it might be. This tenure died out during the Saracen ascendancy; it was revived at the beginning of the fifteenth century. The Portuguese code of about forty years later established *emphyteusis* on a large scale; but whereas the rents demanded by the Romans had been moderate, those exacted by the code of Alphonso V. were so burdensome that the tenant could scarcely supply himself with the necessaries of life. The law of 1832 greatly improved his condition, and, at the present time, though the relations between the landlord and the tenant are not all that could be wished, agrarian discontent and outrage are un-

known. If Portugal is not prosperous, the fact is not due to this particular form of land-tenure, but to the oppressive taxation, the want of roads, and the absence of manufactures. *Emphyteutas*, or *emphyteusis*, prevails also to some extent in Greece and Italy; and although the three countries in which this tenure is found are among the least productive in Europe, bearing in mind the great advantages of soil and climate which they possess, it cannot be said that the deficiency is caused by the custom in question.

The Irish Land Bill was introduced into the House of Commons on February 16th, and was read a third time on May 30th. For three months and a half did the "first legislative assembly in the world" devote to this measure the greater portion of its time and thought. Probably, no measure was ever so thoroughly debated before. It occupies (we speak of it as it left the Lower House) thirty-three printed foolscap pages, and it consists of seventy clauses, and a schedule arranged under the five heads of Law of Compensation to Tenants, Sale of Land to Tenants, Advances by and Powers of Board, Supplemental Provisions, and Miscellaneous. It was the first of these five parts which gave rise to the greatest amount of discussion. Conservative landowners who (as Mr. Mill remarks in his able article in the *Fortnightly Review* for June) have, since the downfall of Protectionism, considered political economy a term of honour instead of, as it used to be, a term of reproach, held that the first principles of the science were violated by this measure, and denounced vehemently any interference with freedom of contract. It was sufficient answer to these objectors that the system of land-tenure in this country, so far from being in strict accordance with the rules of science, which must be of universal application, was different from the land-system of almost every other country in the world. Moreover, as Mr. Mill adds:—

"The principles of political economy, as of every other department of knowledge, are a different thing from its practical precepts. The same principles require different precepts wherever different means are required for the same ends. If the interest of landlords does not afford sufficient security to tenants, it is not contrary, but in the strictest conformity, to the teachings of political economy to provide other security instead. The absolute power of landlords over the soil is what political economy really condemns; and condemns in England as well as in Ireland, though its economic mischiefs are not, in England, so flagrant and unqualified."

In Ireland there were landlords who printed on the backs of the receipts, which they gave to their tenants when paying

the rent, a notice to quit in six months, so that these tenants were wholly at the mercy of their landlords, and, of course, could not afford to lay out, upon their holdings, any capital, or more labour than was sufficient to keep them from starvation. It is an abuse of language to call such relations as this "freedom of contract." Nevertheless, the phrase was repeatedly used, and, if we are to judge by some of the divisions which took place in the House of Commons, there were at least 150 gentlemen aspiring to legislate for this great nation, who believed that political economy would be violated by an interference with this tyranny. This, however, ought not to surprise those who remember how class-interest once blinded Liberal millowners, and how they, too, called in the science to their aid, and protested in its name against interference between capital and labour, and the freedom of supply and demand. Neither party can reproach the other in this matter. The opposition to the Factory Acts was even stronger than the opposition to the Irish Land Bill has been.

The debates upon this Bill are still too recent to render necessary any lengthened exposition of its provisions. They may be briefly summarised:—Clause I. legalises Ulster tenant-right; that is, gives to what has hitherto been only a custom the force of law. Clause II. legalises similar customs existing outside Ulster. Clause III. states the compensation which is to be given to evicted tenants in the absence of the Ulster or any similar custom; this compensation may be as much as seven years' rental where the rent is £10, but must never exceed £250. Clause IV. gives compensation for improvements which the tenant has made, and which are not exhausted at the time of giving up his holding. Clause V. provides that, in the absence of proof to the contrary, the improvements made on a farm of less than £100 a year rental shall be deemed to have been made by the tenants. These are the chief clauses of this part of the Bill, and it will be seen at once that three new and most important principles have been established. A tenant holding under any tenure of less duration than a thirty-one years' lease is not to be evicted capriciously without the landlord paying for his caprice in the shape of compensation to the evicted tenant; the tenant is entitled to compensation for unexhausted improvements; and whereas it has always been assumed hitherto that improvements have been made by the landlord, and the tenant has been compelled to prove that he has made them, the assumption is now in favour of the tenant, and the burden of proof is on the landlord. Subsequent clauses of the first

part of the Act provide for the establishment of courts in which all disputes with regard to tenure and all questions of compensation are to be tried. This part of the Bill was objected to on the ground that it would promote litigation ; but to provide the necessary legal tribunal is not to stimulate resort to it. The whole object and tenor of the Bill is to render such resort unnecessary. " Limited owners " have power under the Bill to grant leases for a term not exceeding thirty-one years. The second part of the Act provides for the sale of lands by the landlords to their tenants, and this and the succeeding part are generally supposed to have Mr. Bright for their originator. Somewhat to the general surprise, it is Mr. Bright's proposals which have been received with most favour by the Conservative peers. The third part empowers the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland to advance money to landlords for improvements ; to tenants for the purchase of their holdings, or of estates in the Landed Estates Court. The last-mentioned provision is contained in Clause XL., which enacts that the Board may advance any sum not exceeding two-thirds of the price of the holding at 5 per cent., to be repayable in thirty-five years. The interest is to be an annuity charged upon the land, and having priority of all other claims ; but it may be commuted at any time, if the purchaser is prepared to pay the then value of the annuity. It remains to be seen how far the State will be able to keep its debtors up to the mark. We confess to having some doubt on the subject, and we look forward with some anxiety to the prospect of the State endeavouring to obtain payment of arrears from its defaulting tenants. For this, as well as for other reasons, we regret that Mr. Gladstone did not assent to Mr. Morrison's amendment, embodying Judge Longfield's proposal. This eminent authority would enable the landlord and the tenant to establish, by mutual consent, a statutory tenant-right, the rent to be agreed upon between them, and to be revised every seven years. If at the expiration of that period the tenant prefers to go out rather than pay an increased rent, he would be entitled to seven years' purchase of his holding, and also to the same compensation if the landlord declined to lower the rent ; the compensation to be based upon the reduced rental demanded by the tenant. In a word, if the landlord thinks the rent too low, he can raise it, and should the tenant object to pay it, the latter can demand to be bought out at a price equal to seven years of the former rental. On the other hand, if the tenant wants an alteration of rent, the landlord may, rather than make the reduc-

tion, buy out the tenant on the same terms. Mr. Gladstone objected to this proposal on the practical ground that it would involve a Government valuation of rents, and also for the somewhat fanciful reason that it would lead to the increase of the idler and lounge class, who, having nothing else to do but to draw their rents from their property, would have no feeling of responsibility towards their tenants. The first objection is answered by saying that the existing rental would be taken as the basis of the transaction, and therefore there would be much less valuation by Government than there will be under the Ministerial scheme with its courts of arbitration. The second objection is met by the reply that the landlord is too often at present a mere lounge, with the additional disadvantage that he will neither work himself nor suffer the tenant to do all the work that he might do. Under Judge Longfield's arrangement the landlord would, at least, be harmless, and there is no reason why he should not make as good a use of his rent as the fund-holder does of his *rente*. However, if we have not in the Irish Land Bill all that we might desire, we gladly admit that it is a great and beneficent measure, and we sincerely hope and believe that it will do much towards the restoration of peace and prosperity to a country that, as yet, can hardly be said to have known either.

ART. VII.—*Neun Apologetische Vorträge ueber einige wichtige Fragen und Wahrheiten des Christenthums.* [Apologetic Lectures on some Important Questions and Truths of Christianity.] By Drs. ZÖCKLER, CREMER, FUCHS, LUTHARDT, UHLHORN, GESS, TISCHENDORF, LANGE, and DISSELHOFF. Gotha: Perthes.

AN excellent society for the defence and propagation of the Gospel at home is established in Bremen; and this work is published under its auspices, being a series of lectures on some of the most important truths of Christianity. The Christian Church in that district is deeply tinctured with infidelity, and that of the most offensive form. The learned men whose names are on the title-page of this volume, as lecturers, have gathered from various parts in defence of the common truth on one of its most important battle-fields. We will take a hasty glance at the various topics thus discussed, as preparatory to a few more general remarks.

Dr. Zöckler, of Greifswald, a young but very distinguished divine, heads the list with an essay on the relation between the history of the Creation and natural science generally, and the Christian religion. He is worthy to take the lead; partly on account of his extraordinary theological attainments and services, partly as the editor of a valuable monthly apologetic serial, *The Demonstration of the Faith*, and especially as the author of a valuable work on *Natural Theology*, viewed on strictly Scriptural principles. He is one of the most remarkable instances to be found of the combination of theological learning in all departments with a lively interest in the current questions of the day. Messrs. Clark have made the English public acquainted with his *Commentary on the Proverbs*, and we doubt not that some others of his expository and historical works will, sooner or later, be known among us. In a former treatise on *The Primitive History of the Earth and Man*, he exhibited in a popular manner what science had to say as to the successive populations of the earth's surface, and the unity and antiquity of the human race, appending his defence of Scripture with equal modesty, learning, and geniality. The lecture in the present volume is a very fair attempt to grapple especially with some of the difficulties which have been raised in England. Whatever may have been or may be the pre-eminence of Germans in Biblical destructive theorising, there can be no doubt that science has troubled

the faith more in England than anywhere else. In one sense we may be proud of our Lyells and Darwins and Huxleys ; but in another we cannot but feel that the great English school of scientific explorers are doing more to undermine the confidence of English young men in the Word of God than any other body of men. We do not think that the answer they need has as yet been forthcoming. Nor do we expect it, save from our own writers. The foreign replies to English scientific assaults, or exposures of English unsound theories, have not been very happy, as a rule. Dr. Zöckler's is hardly an exception, although it is scarcely right to say so, remembering the necessary limits of a short popular address. The offence taken at the Mosaic account is very vigorously characterised ; its restless repugnance to the limitation of the Old Testament monotheism with its creative " Let there be," to the seeming childishness of the six days' works, to the abruptness of the creative beginnings and the absence of links of development ; and its unbelieving slavery to a sceptical superstition of its own. It is well shown how inconsistent it is that youthful sciences, with nothing as yet but unripe results—results so immature that one decennium demolishes the results of its predecessor before hazarding its own—should wage a portentous warfare with the ancient truths of the Scripture. Lyell is then specially introduced, and the uniformitarian quietistic theory, which deals so ruthlessly with ages past. After many observations of a defensive character, suggested by what science has taught concerning catastrophes, and the changes of temperature, the lecturer dwells on the antagonism between the theory and the uniform traditions of all nations, which extend as high as, but not higher than, some twenty-five or twenty-seven hundred years beyond the Flood. Hence the charge of over-faith, urged with some show of reason against those whose theory imposes more on the credulity of its votaries than even the Jewish Scriptures. Then follows an elaborate disquisition on the connection between sceptical criticism of the Scriptural origins and sceptical attacks on the Scriptural eschatology, and on the fundamental character of the doctrine of creation in regard to all the verities of the Christian salvation.

There is a point upon which Dr. Zöckler, here and elsewhere, much insists, and which we think should enter more largely into Christian apologetics ; and that is the unlimited difficulties and embarrassments in which those are entangled who renounce the one account of the world's beginning that has commanded, more or less, the consent of mankind. First of

all, there is the enormous difficulty of supposing that, under the government of a supreme Creator, man has been left without any kind of testimony concerning the beginning of his own history, and of God's dealings with him on the earth. In the Bible we have a consistent account, consistently maintained through thousands of years, and connected with all God's subsequent manifestations down to the end of time—an account which has been received by a large portion of mankind, the only one which has been free from the wildest extravagances, and the only one, too, which has ever been accepted by other nations than that amidst which it had its rise. Then comes the amazing difficulty of the hypotheses of pantheism, or materialism, or development—not one of which can sustain the test of science, or would for one moment be maintained by a dispassionate observer; that is, by an observer unwarping by prejudice against the Scriptural theory, and reasoning in the spirit of submission to God. The fact is, and there is no propriety in concealing it, the general tendency of opinions that displace or revolt at the Mosaic cosmogony is to displace and renounce the living God. The science that takes no pains to keep its fidelity to the revealed Word is, openly or latently, avowedly or unconsciously, eager to be *without God in the world*, in the scientific sense of that mournful expression.

The leap is not a great one from the Mosaic creation to the great faculties of the intellectual and moral nature of the head of God's creation—man. Dr. Cremer—the same Hermann Cremer, we presume, whose admirable theological Lexicon to the Greek Testament we have lately announced—discourses next on *Reason, Conscience, and Revelation*. He sets out by ascertaining what is according to reason and what are the primary principles of conscience. The word that unites all here is truth. Reason he thinks the faculty of discerning and acknowledging the truth, that which is eternally true and demonstrable, the eternal principles of right: the conscience is the faculty that carries all this into the life—the practical life—under the idea of righteousness. Truth is for man, and man is for the truth; he has an adaptation for it and need for it. The demonstration of truth lies in this absolute affinity, its full and perfect human character while retaining its Divine elevation. It opens the eyes of man to behold itself, so that it becomes manifest why human nature longs for truth—truth is man's life; as also why his nature trembles before it—truth is equally man's death. Truth must needs bear witness of itself to man as a person in harmony with man's personality; face answering to face.

If the demands of man's reason and conscience for the revelation of truth were never satisfied, mankind would be for ever wavering between the two poles of renunciation and enjoyment, restless and unresting.

The question next arises as to what has been attained or discovered by the human mind, in its great intellectual and spiritual workings, without the intervention of a Divine revelation. The philosophy which revolves around self-denial and gratification bears in itself the elements of despair, and excludes the very idea of a higher endeavour. Wherever the nobler striving does present itself, it is stamped with this signature: "Man wanders ever so long as he strives." The wisdom of this world found its fundamental lines, and rose to the presentiments and anticipations of highest truth; but its wisdom never became the common heritage of the world. When Christianity entered the world, with its revelation of truth, there began a mighty intellectual and spiritual contest between it and the erring endeavours of men. But, the writer asks, is there any reasonableness or right in the protest of this world's wisdom against that Divine revelation which in the Holy Scriptures has its own self-demonstration? It is only by the Scripture that conscience, with its profound meaning, has been revealed in man; and its first testimony was the consciousness of our estrangement from God, the source of all kinds of mistakes as to His nature and claims. God's revelation of Himself is thus an act of Divine freedom, of free love, of redeeming grace. God is grace and truth, the God of reconciliation, as the revelation of the Trinity avows, which cannot be apprehended according to any human notion of number, nor as a metaphysical dogma, but under the point of view of the infinite life of God, which produces also life in us.

Here, as almost always, German apologetics pass into the region of mysticism. But here also, as generally, the good sense, true learning, and Christian reverence of the writer help him to recover. We sympathise with his protest against the idea of such a revelation being impossible, or that the miraculous or supernatural intervention which brings it should be thought a thing incredible. Again, there is a noble indication of the possibility, probability, and certainty that the objective revelation of God would be met by a subjective, internal enlightenment. Not, indeed, a sixth sense, or a new faculty, but a distinct and Divinely-imparted power of apprehending what passes beyond the common limits of daily life, is to be expected.

Granted the Divine revelation of the Word, it follows that there must be a Divine revelation to the heart. This supreme principle will more and more enter into the defences of Christianity, in proportion as Christian apologists are filled with humble boldness. Dr. Cremer's views are well worth reading, although we cannot but think that the English treatment of the faculty of conscience is more philosophical than the German.

Pastor Fuchs deals with the vexed question of the *miracle*, and says almost all that can be said, or need be said, on the subject. Of all the subjects of contention between Christianity and unbelief this seems to be the simplest: one the terms and conditions and issues of which may be most easily stated. The question is God or no God; an intelligent Author of the universe, or chance; a personal Administrator of law, or law absolutely that has no genesis, and of which no account can be given. The lecturer simply defines miracle as "the entrance of the supernatural into the sphere of the natural; the descent of a higher order and economy into the lower; the immediate interference of the supernatural God with the course of nature and the world." Then follows a clear account of pantheism and materialism, which are united in this, that they deny the real and independent existence of anything supernatural, but thereby contradict the fundamental principles of all thinking, inasmuch as they forbid every question as to the whence and why; silence every inquiry of the natural philosopher in man; and refuse to acknowledge the idea of a final end of all things, or of any. Perhaps it is impossible to suggest a stronger argument than this, whereby to refute the godless philosophy that is beginning, or at least extending, its reign. Deism is then examined, which subverts the living communion between God and the world, altogether shutting its eyes to the fact that the world is manifestly, on the evidence of endless facts, confirmed by the instincts of all men, the theatre on which are played out the acts of human free-will, and the scene in which the Divine free-will is also operant. That prayers have their effect is too obvious to be intelligently doubted; and it is evident that there is at least no contradiction in the idea that a Lawgiver of unlimited power should place particular instances under special laws. Whatever weakness there may be detected in this argument, there is none in what follows. The glorious doctrine of the immanence of God in His own creature is well expounded. Natural forces do not operate in any case without the direct intervention (if the misnomer of interven-

tion may be tolerated) of the Creator. The laws of nature have their life and being in the Divine power, which power it is that causes them to produce or accomplish this or that. Out of the fulness of that primitive power, that primordial beginning of all energy which pervades in infinite manifestations the universe, He can at any moment create a new thing, in perfect independence of powers already operating, but giving what He accomplishes the semblance of being for the time a miracle. That which corresponds with His will cannot militate against any natural law.

All this is admirable. How far the argument is helped by the appeal to nature, as containing the elements of constant miracle, is questionable. The fact that there are bound up with the forces of nature innumerable powers and principles, waiting in readiness for higher developments—or rather for the attainment of higher ends in the Divine plan of creation—does not of itself strengthen the case for miraculous interventions; but it does not, as some would be ready to assert, say anything to weaken it. But when this is connected with the idea that these elements were introduced in readiness for that higher design which culminated in the redeeming work, and required for its prosecution and attainment the bestowment of a new and higher life of regeneration—which, therefore, being miracle to others, is no miracle to the regenerate, blessed with the requisite organs of knowledge—the lecturer enters upon a province which is very fascinating to the mystic, and over which Psalm viii. sheds a rich lustre, but which, for the purpose and aim of Christian apologetics, is interdicted ground. Nowhere in this province is wisdom more necessary than in the distinguishing between what may be good and wholesome doctrine for the believer, but meat too strong for the sceptic.

Luthardt, on the Person of Christ, is rather declamatory than scientific; but the rhetoric of so close a thinker and accurate an exegete has its own value. The Person of the God-man is, according to St. Paul, the great mystery; and it will probably be such to all eternity. It is to be received and adored, but not to be understood. But, impenetrable itself, it is the key to the understanding of all other otherwise incomprehensible mysteries. Jesus is the Founder of a religion, but, unlike every other founder, His religion alone produces an effectual renewal of the face of society; His Church alone has in it the element of eternal youth; and His doctrine and cause mightily move upon, and irresistibly enchain, the minds of all men, in all times, and of all races. As the Son of man,

He discloses for us the secret of man—of man and of men. The history of Israel becomes clear to us only in the knowledge of Christ; the fact of mankind, and the history of the race, is an absolutely unsolvable riddle, without a single clue to its solution, until the goal and end of all its ways is found in Christ. We cannot any of us understand the perplexing fact of our own existence and destiny until we find Christ; knowing Him we begin to understand ourselves, what we should be, and what we would be, and what we must be. Such He is as the Son of man—the Teacher who teaches man the secret of his being. As the Son of God, He is the key to the knowledge of God also. Nothing concerning God could be called knowledge until He brought it. The union of His two natures presents, on the one hand, the elevation of humanity to God and on the other the condescension of God to us. He is the revelation of the holy love of God, as the world longed for, but never knew it. And whosoever rejects Him loses both man and God: he gives up the only method of acquainting himself with his own species and with the God who made him.

To all this we would add, that the Person of Christ, God-man, in the unity of Person in two natures, is the solution of most of the difficulties in Christian theology. The true doctrine of the unity of His Person, carried through all departments of His work, will be found to defend the Christian faith against most of the perversions of its own friends. Almost all the heresies of ancient and modern times, with their older or their more recent names, fly in succession before the true statement of this doctrine. The very nature of God, and the very nature of man, in one Person! What an effectual protest does this lift up against the higher excesses of Calvinism, against all forms of Arianism and Socinianism, against the errors that are limited to speculation concerning Christ's temptation and those which affect practice! But the volume which we consider does not leave the department of apology for Christianity addressed to those without. And Dr. Luthardt keeps closely to his theme, though no one is more competent to extend the subject, had it been admissible to do so.

Before we pass from this lecture, a word or two may be spoken as to the effect upon minds not friendly to Christians of the Lutheran controversies on the Person of Christ, and the character of His humiliation into the likeness of sinful human nature. We have read with dismay some recent speculations as to the *kenosis* of the Divine nature of the Eternal Son, or His emptying of Himself in order to our

redemption. No divines are so bold as the Germans in their incursions into forbidden regions; and none are so unshrinking in their pursuit of a dogma into all its imagined consequences. It is hard to say which has most offended the sceptics, the enormities of Roman Catholic demands on credulity or the enormities of hyper-Lutheran demands on speculative faith. Happily for us in England, our translations from the German are generally limited to works that avoid the extremes, although there are not wanting pages in some popular theologians of the foreign school which must be very bewildering to the English reader.

The fifth lecture dwells on the Resurrection of Christ as a fact in the history of redemption. Dr. Uhlhorn is not much known among English theologians, save through the medium of quotation and allusion; but he is a sound divine, and enters thoroughly and satisfactorily into many questions of deep interest, some of which, however, scarcely connect themselves in any way with English thought or modes of thinking. This remark applies in some measure to this paper. It begins by setting aside the preliminary objection to the fact of Our Lord's resurrection which is based upon its being a miraculous occurrence. It then lays down and dwells upon the proposition that the early Church believed in the resurrection on the ground of the express and clear testimonies of its witnesses, and that the Church was built upon this belief. After this the essay drifts somewhat out of our latitude. The Baurian attempts to explain this fact in relation to so great a crisis in human history, which attempts leave it an inexplicable mystery, are exposed in all their unworthiness, as are also the hypotheses of the older Rationalism, which assumed an only apparent death of Jesus. These we partly understand, but we are not so familiar with the hypotheses of visions which the assailants of Christianity in Germany are so fond of. The theory of St. Paul's visions is demolished with a masterly hand: for instance, it is shown with great force that the Apostle must have believed in Christ's resurrection before he had the so-called visions, since doubters have no visions; and that a morbid and fanatical continuous propagation of such visions in the case of hundreds is a monstrosity not to be mentioned.

Descending to the nature of Our Saviour's risen body, the writer discusses the notion that St. Paul shared the Jewish conception, according to which the soul of Jesus, divested of its earthly body, was clothed with a body of another nature; as also Schenkel's hypothesis that Christ's manifestation was

that of a higher spiritual corporeity. Dr. Uhlhorn insists on preserving the literalness of the history and the reality of the Saviour's body. The theological importance of the Saviour's resurrection, and its bearing on our salvation, demands imperatively the bodily reappearance. Only that would have constituted the true victory over death and the pledge of our resurrection, and only a Saviour veritably the same after as before His atoning death could consummate and dispense the saving grace of the Christian covenant. The ancient contest of the Church with false gnosis, which aimed to dissolve the facts of redemption into phantasies, are well shown to be returning on us. This is not so much prophesied as announced and proved. But it is predicted also with equal confidence that the modern Church of Christ will conquer again, and still more gloriously conquer, if it holds fast the truth that the facts of redemption were really such, and that the living Redeemer is present in all the fulness of His veritable human reality and power among His people and in His Church.

Once more we have to express our satisfaction at witnessing the tone assumed by German defenders of the Christian faith. The mythical Rationalists, with their unreal hypotheses to account for the universal faith in the resurrection of Christ, have been treated with too much forbearance. Many have allowed themselves to be frightened too easily out of their old-fashioned and simple confidence in the resurrection of the Redeemer as a fact testified by evidences too full and clear and explicit to be controverted by any whose minds are not blinded by prejudice.

The doctrine of the Atonement follows hard, as it ought, on the Resurrection that interprets it, and finds an able expositor and advocate in Dr. Gess. He takes his point of departure, where Christian theologians should always seek it, in the words of our Saviour Himself, especially those in the first and last of the Four Gospels. Connecting with these the leading testimonies of the leading Apostles, he conducts an able defence of the principles of a vicarious satisfaction. It is refreshing to find German divines protesting against the abuse of the doctrine of love as displayed in the Atonement, while vindicating its supremacy, as they always do, in that Atonement. Dr. Gess, however, enters on rather perilous ground when he argues from the analogy of earthly parents and children. The father, whose erring child seeks to be restored to friendly and affectionate intercourse with him, demands the token of earnestness which expiatory acts afford; and the expiation of our sin is also necessary before God, as

is testified, not only by the assurance of His Word, but also by the witness of man's own spirit, inwardly and surely conscious of freedom and of obligation to render obedience to the law of God. The eternal and inexorable demand for satisfaction is boldly and unhesitatingly laid down; nor can anyone who receives the Holy Scriptures, and marks how surely they correspond with the secret instincts of man's heart, doubt that the argument is a sound one.

And now the lecturer proceeds to refer this to Jesus our Representative. The Redeemer became in His own person the root and stem of the human race, so that all His actions and sufferings—His entire obedience—availed for man. He felt over sinful mankind an infinite sorrow, bewailing in His own holy displeasure the universal sin of man as a father mourns over the sin of his rebellious son. His whole existence became a prayer of intercession for the sin of the world. In His baptism He uttered the great confession of sin for all men; and, more than that, avowed His assumption of the responsibility of man to suffer for his sin. At that crisis the Father accepted the great confession made by the Incarnate, at the same time that He declared Him to be His well-beloved Son. Then did our Saviour and Representative go on His way of suffering, enduring the enmity of man, abandonment of God, and the bitterness of death itself. Thus was the justice of God satisfied, His holy displeasure against sin propitiated, and the Redeemer's work of atonement made perfect.

Comparing notes with our Continental brethren, we find that very much the same kind of objections to the New Testament doctrine of expiation are encountered by them and by us. In fact, there is more uniformity in sceptical objection here than in any other department of theology. In Germany, as in England, France, and America, the effort is ceaselessly put forth to make the love of God all in all, and to obliterate from the theory of the Atonement every element of wrath against sin. In England the effect is seen in the view taken of the atoning work generally, which soon ceases to have anything distinctly propitiatory in it. In Germany, among the best writers, that is, the effect is traceable rather in the views entertained of the Divine attributes in their harmony in Christ and at the Cross. To be more plain, and speaking very generally, the English difficulty leads to a misinterpretation of the Cross itself. Amongst the German theologians the atoning work of Christ is not so much affected as the philosophy of the harmony and reconciliation of the perfections of God. Yonder the embarrassment is rather abstract, with us it is rather concrete.

But this whole subject has more to do with our internal differences of opinion than with our defensive attitude as against the infidel. And to this latter we are now limited.

In this goodly company of apologists the name of Constantine Tischendorf is found, and it is not without unfeigned thankfulness that we note how indefatigably he sustains in every way the cause of truth. It is a matter of no small congratulation that the foremost critic of the New Testament text, and the ablest living arbiter of all questions affecting the genuineness and integrity of the primitive documents of the Christian faith, should at the same time be one of the most decided champions of the inspiration and authority of the Word of God as the Church holds it. Dr. Tischendorf has had to endure much in the defence of the truth. Some of his assailants, such as Hilgenfeld and Volkmar, are men of great research and subtlety, and have not hesitated to charge him with dogmatism and wresting of facts. But he has gone on his way, correcting his own errors in matters of diplomatic criticism whenever convinced that he was wrong, and thus perfecting by slow degrees his great recension. One thing, however, he has never revised or changed—his unfaltering confidence that the whole economy of our salvation is bound up with the testimonies concerning Our Lord's redeeming life and death which are common to the Evangelists and St. Paul's Epistles. His essay on the construction of the Four Gospels is, or ought to be, familiar to most of us; and the protest lifted up against the German and French mythical theories. Speaking in it of Renan's book, he says, "And thus we see in it one of the most fearful signs of the times—that French frivolity and German learning should join friendly hands over the newly-dug sepulchre of Our Lord."

The present lecture adds nothing noteworthy on the subject. We have only to observe that it indicates what very great efforts are put forth by both parties. Alas! that such words should be used in regard to the origin and age and relations of the Evangelical records. Perhaps in no department of research is more energy exhibited than in this, nor is it wonderful that it should be so. Whatever pre-eminence the writings of St. Paul may have as the doctrinal exposition of the common faith, another kind of pre-eminence will always be accorded to the books that describe the first manifestation of God in the flesh, and the first utterances of the oracle of eternal truth. If the Gospels are established—the Three and the One—all is established; whatever uncertainty rests upon them throws its shadow of doubt over the rest. There are

not wanting indications, in Germany and Holland, at least, that the attack on St. Paul is partially suspended, and that the origin of the Gospels is about to be the leading question of the day. The second Tübingen generation—or is it the third?—are bringing out volume after volume on the Synoptists and St. John individually; and the slight glance we have had of these makes us look round with some eagerness, but without any anxiety, for the men of God who are to meet the Philistines. Dr. Tischendorf will be one of them. He will not be the foremost, though he will be far from the least, of those whose labours will help to uphold the conviction expressed by himself, “that in the entire literature of antiquity there are few examples of so noble an authentication as our Four Gospels have, to the perfect conviction of every sincere student.” It is matter of satisfaction that he has been able to carry his labours on the recension of the text so successfully through the Four Gospels—the fruits of which now lie before us in his eighth edition—and we cannot help thinking that these prosperous labours will exert a good influence on all controversy yet to come concerning the original Gospels. We do not put our trust in man. Especially in relation to the sacred Gospels would we deprecate any undue dependence on the wisdom of flesh and blood; but it is a pleasant thought, after all, that the most eminent critics in England and Germany are most orthodox in their faith.

The *Kingdom of God and its Consummation*, and the significance of this idea for historical Christendom, is the subject taken up by our eloquent and versatile friend Lange, who has treated it with uncommon power. We have less pleasure, however, in following this thinker in his speculations than we had in following his predecessors. The problems of Providence, and the Providential government of the world, are rendered repulsive, as well as mysterious, by the peculiar terminology and style of speculation that German thinkers affect. Words can hardly describe the difference between our Bishop Butler, for instance, pleading with such irresistible persuasion the ignorance and limitation of man, and the quiet pedantry with which the most well-meaning German philosophers spin their webs of theorising concerning the future. There is very little profit in one out of a thousand of the elaborate speculative systems that are woven by vigorous imaginations, seconded by industrious hands, out of the scanty elements of positive revelation. From the days of Papias until these days, the Christian Church has had to endure a succession, never interrupted, of apocalyptic schemes

and visions: this kind of light or imaginative literature has never lacked writers or readers yet. There has been nothing more continuous, nothing more varied in its continuity, than this kind of traditional speculation. The German contribution has always had a certain stamp of its own, being not so much imaginative or mystical, as philosophical and speculative. This essay is a very fair representative. It deserves careful reading, and, perhaps, more profound study than we can give it: such a study might tend to elevate and broaden our views of the great future of the commonwealth of Christendom, and of the mysterious problems of Divine Providence.

Still, we confess that there is here much to mystify. "The final end of the world is the kingdom of God in its consummation; that is, the full realisation of the human kingdom of spirits, free and blessed in love; which kingdom God has founded in His personal manifestation in Christ, through creation and redemption, that it might be consummated in a glorious manifestation, by means of the sanctification of individual souls into the fellowship of life and love, under the supreme ascendancy of the Word, in the freedom of the spirit." There is a fine basis of comprehensible truth here; but it affords little help to be further told that the foundations of the kingdom of God are laid in the great counterparts, antinomies, or antitheses of human life. The prosecution of this idea, as the writer evolves it, would require a special Teutonic education, to which we lay no claim, for its apprehension. The first time that we can catch the thread, after a long labyrinth, we find that the first New Testament antithetical element in the new kingdom of the new life is the organic, the consummation of the individual in his profound and perfect union with Christ; the allegorical, as a higher power of the psychological, resting on the distinction between fundamental truths and the temporary definitions of faith; the social, in reference to the relation of Church and State; the cosmical, as a higher power of the economical, so far as Christianity belongs to the world. All this is very wearisome, and much out of place, one would think, in a system of popular apologetics. But we must not judge of other minds and other habits of thought by our own; and, moreover, these disquisitions are only the introduction to an Evangelical review of the various representations given in the New Testament of the come and coming kingdom of Christ.

There is something very impressive and affecting in the consideration of the unlimited variety of compact, reasoned, and enthusiastically advocated theories concerning the "com-

ing of God's kingdom" that crowd what our neighbours call the eschatological literature of Christendom. Without referring to the views held by men who are without, what a bewildering study is the Future as believed in by Bible-reading, if not orthodox, Christians! At one extremity is the Romanist, who thinks that the only horizon to which the eyes of the faithful need be turned is the millennium of one universal Christendom, pervading, but as a conquering power from above, all the political institutions of the world, and bound together by submission to one visible authority, whose mandate shall be the voice of God, absolute, and from which there can be no appeal. The eye of that theory is not so much turned to a time when Christ shall have put down all authority and all power, as to a time when Christ's vicergerent on earth shall have put down all authority and power. And the millennial visions of Romanism beyond that golden age are left indeterminate—more indeterminate even than those of other less arbitrary systems—waiting, it may be, for the decisions of some coming councils as to the condition of men in the end of the world and in eternity. At the opposite pole, among those who believe in the Scriptures as a Divine revelation, there is the theory of universal restoration, which is fast spreading, under various disguises,—the theory which regards Providence and Redemption as two names for one thing, the process by which an omnipotent God—whose omnipotence and love are the same, but with emphasis on the omnipotence—is gradually extirpating sin from the universe, and abolishing the fact and the very memory of evil. With *that end coming*, all intermediate theories are, as it were, only pleasant and stimulating theological exercises. The transcendent certainty that a time will come, if time it may be called, when the watchman shall never more respond to the anxious questioner, "The night cometh," but only, "The morning is come," gives to all subordinate details a comparatively unimportant character. The light affliction of a universe stricken with sin "endureth but a moment," though millennia of millennia may have been laden with anguish. To those who hold these notions, the still small voice of the remonstrant Bible soon ceases to have any articulate meaning, and they become reckless in their insane charity. Now, between these two extremes come in a great number of theories, which are perfectly lawful while they hold fast the great principles which the Apostle Paul laid down to Timothy, when he gave his final lesson concerning the mingled state of the Church upon earth. Setting out with the everlasting

axiom that "the foundation of God standeth sure"—which of itself gives assurance of an institution abiding amidst eternal ruins—he places in the hand of the believer the charter of the house, with its double seal: on the one side conveying the certainty that God for ever makes a distinction between His own and the ungodly; and, on the other, that departing from iniquity is the safeguard which the individual must throw around his own faith. It is there that the Apostle Paul leaves the question: the coming of Christ's kingdom is no further dilated on. His last word before this had been concerning the "putting down of all authority," which might in itself give something like plausibility to the doctrine of the extinction of evil, if it had not to be interpreted in the light of sayings placed on record before and afterwards, such as those in the Epistles to the Thessalonians and Romans, which speak of an everlasting destruction, and the being cast out. Students following St. Paul alone would, like him, cry, "O the depth!" and abstain from all beyond the plain and awful letter of Scripture. But St. John, an equal authority, has seemed to encourage the study of apocalyptic subjects, pronouncing what appears to be a benediction on the habitual attempt to penetrate these mysteries. German theologians have followed St. John almost with one consent; sometimes with much manifest blessing in doing so; but sometimes also with much rebuke mingled with the blessing, as was pre-eminently the case with that most lovely of all apocalyptic reckoners and dreamers, J. A. Bengel.

It will not appear surprising to those who have observed the current of Christian and anti-Christian literature that the Bremen apologists have closed their course with an essay on "Christianity and Culture." Dr. Disselhoff points out that, in the derivation of the two words, cultus and culture, worship and cultivation are closely related, and hence that the true honour of the Deity and the discharge of all duties to Him stand in living connection with the discharge of all human obligations and proprieties in every relation of men to each other—an admirable theme, whether ethically or apologetically viewed. Here it is, of course, handled as suggesting a word against the enemies of Christianity and for the encouragement of its friends. Our lecturer is no enemy of ancient classical culture; he belongs to a Church and to a school of theology that has placed itself, by a thousand tokens, beyond the reach of such an imputation. It is, therefore, without any fanaticism that he paints the barbarism and vileness that infected the most beautiful manifestations of ancient civilisation, whether

viewed in the state, in art, or in science, or in social life. He shows that the highest philosophy of ancient times had no forecast or anticipation of the notion of a humankind, one and called into a unity of development, any more than it had any definite idea of man's true personality. Christianity first laid the foundation of true human culture, whether man is viewed in himself or in relation to others, by bringing in a power that has for its object the destruction of sin, the enemy of all culture. Here is a fine subject, and the author pursues it with vigour, and enthusiasm, and intelligence through the several departments of free individuality, the marriage and family relations, the political and social interests, and, finally, art and science. We think that this is a topic which will bear further handling, and is capable of more apologetic application than it has yet had. It is not a factitious argument. There is reality in it; and our English Evidences should give it more prominence.

A better example we cannot have than our Continental fellow-Christians set us. Scarcely a year passes without the publication of some such volume as has been cursorily noticed in these pages. Now it comes from Amsterdam, now from Leipzig, now from Geneva, now from Strassburg, now from Bremen; and these lectures are occupied with the most important questions of the day, written by the ablest men that can be pressed into the service, and delivered before the most imposing and important congregations that zeal and personal influence can assemble. But where is the counterpart of all this among ourselves? Lectures enough we have on subjects of miscellaneous and sometimes transitory interest, written and delivered often by professional lecturers for ends lower than the highest. We have also an occasional controversial handling of topics of the highest importance in the highest style in our great permanent apologetic institutions, such as the university lectures; but such lectures as these, combining high art and popular execution, are rare among us. We seldom hear of them at all. Why is there not kept up a running series of such defences of Christianity in all our great centres? In such strongholds of infidelity as might be named by the score in the Northern part, indeed in all parts, of the Kingdom, why is there not always heard the voice of the popular pleader for Christ and His misunderstood Gospel? We have learnt much evil from Germany and Holland: let us learn from them this good thing also, and unite the efforts of the best thinkers and writers in the service of our common faith.

ART. VIII.—*St. Paul and Protestantism*; with an Introduction on Puritanism and the Church of England. By MATTHEW ARNOLD, M.A., LL.D. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1870.

THE observations which we have to make on this volume will have for their object neither a criticism of its author as a theological teacher, nor an analysis of his work as a theological treatise. We have already more than once expressed our sense of Mr. Arnold's high character as a genial writer and effective satirist; as well as of his narrowness and affectation of originality, and assumption of oracular authority. There is nothing in this book to change our opinion. As to the book itself, it would be unfair to examine elaborately a few serial papers themselves suggested by a greater work on the same subject, and expanded by introductory essays into an independent existence. Nor should we think it within our province to notice it at all were we not assured that its influence is, at present, and is likely to be for a season, considerable. Mr. Arnold is an attractive writer, and one of the most popular advocates of a kind of Christianity that is just now in the ascendant. Most of the other writers who have defended or promulgated the medley of mysticism, latitudinarianism, positivism, and negativism, which at present withstand the Apostle's doctrine, have published their views in a ponderous form, in the shape of scientific treatises, or philosophic systems, or commentary on the New Testament. Here is one who, in racy and well-chosen English, gives his views in the magazine form which society most affects for its instruction as well as amusement. Many who will not read the disquisitions of Jowett, or the treatises of Strassburg and Leyden and Geneva, will meditate deeply on these ephemeral essays, and feel a power in them which they will hardly know how to gainsay or resist.

Whilst the fugitive character of these productions protects them from very close examination, it does not justify the writer in his choice of the style of treatment bestowed on so grave a subject. Whatever issues may seem to be raised, and however Mr. Arnold may limit his attack, the question really involves the whole system of St. Paul's doctrine. It is not whether Puritanism may or may not have exaggerated

some points in his doctrine, and suppressed some others ; not whether the Anglican formularies have or have not done more complete justice to the whole round of his teaching ; but whether there is or is not anything like a coherent body of truth in St. Paul's writings. Mr. Arnold, or any man who asserts that the current and traditional view of the Pauline theology is utterly unreal, is bound to show, by an analysis of the Apostle's writings, and by a fair induction of evidence from all parts of those writings, that he does not teach what he has been supposed to teach. This the present writer never attempts ; and, what is worse, he leaves a wrong impression of the results of the writings of those who have made the attempt. It might be asserted, with confidence, that of the many learned men who, in Germany, France, Holland, or our own country, have worked out the Apostle's system in Biblical theology, there is scarcely one who would sustain Mr. Arnold's sweeping representations as to the doctrines of redemption and salvation in that system. For instance, we find reference made to Reuss' work on Biblical theology. That work is a very free handling indeed ; but its masterly delineation of St. Paul's system is, in these respects, as opposite to that of the work before us as it well could be.

Mr. Arnold is too good a critic, and too candid a thinker, to deny that the traditional rendering of St. Paul's Christianity is in harmony with what seems to be his meaning in many passages. What course does he, then, adopt ? Does he take those clear and express passages which, in the indisputably genuine letters, exhibit the doctrines of vicarious propitiation and reconciliation through atoning satisfaction, and subject them to a searching investigation, showing clearly how they came to assume the suspicious form they bear ? No ; he does not attempt this ; but quietly, and with boundless assurance, lays down two canons of interpretation, which he himself rejoices over as worthy discoveries of his own, and relies upon to extricate him from every difficulty. They are these : all views of truth that are not scientific and not in keeping with "the progressive thought of humanity," must be set down either to St. Paul's habit of Orientalising, or to his habit of Judaising. Eastern exaggeration, hyperbole, or unregulated trope, must be responsible for very much ; and it is the fault of the readers, that is of the far greater part of the multitudes who have read St. Paul's writings, if they forget that here or there *Paul Orientalises*. Accommodation to Judaic habits of thought, and deference to the old economy, must be responsible for very much more ; and our modern

critic confesses that the endless multitudes who have been misled by *Paul Judaizing* have been misled, not so much by any fault in themselves, as by the Apostle. But there is something so grotesque in the application of Mr. Arnold's latest canon of scientific criticism, and the absolute blindness of mind that could suppose such notions worthy of the subject is so almost incredible, that we must support our assertion by an extract—a fair one, though made up of fragments :—

"The admirable maxim of the great mediæval Jewish school of Biblical critics : *The Law speaks with the tongue of the children of men*—a maxim which is the very foundation of all sane Biblical criticism—was for centuries a dead letter to the whole body of our Western exegesis, and is a dead letter to the whole body of our popular exegesis still. Because, taking the Bible language as equivalent with the language of the scientific intellect—a language which is adequate and absolute—we have never been in a position, even supposing we admitted this maxim of the Jewish doctors, to use the key which it offers to us. But it is certain that, whatever strain the religious expressions of the Semitic genius were meant, in the minds of those who gave utterance to them, to bear, the particular strain which we Western people put upon them is one which they were not meant to bear."—P. 93.

Before introducing the particular passage which gives us the double canon referred to, we must pause to ask with what consistency the Rabbinical quotation can be referred to here. "The Law speaks with the tongue of the children of men"—a most noble principle, reminding us that the inspired Word of God is written in human words and sentences, adapted in infinite wisdom to the intelligence and capacity of men generally; not men of "scientific intellect," but men generally. Now Mr. Arnold will grant that the writings of St. Paul are part of the Law; that, in fact, God employed those writings to "teach the Gentiles in faith and verity," and intended them, in combination with other similar writings, to be to the world at large what the Law of Moses was originally to the Hebrews. Now setting aside the question of a Divine afflatus on St. Paul, and the probability to all men—to us the certainty—that the Divine Spirit did not leave this writer of law to speak his own unguided words, can we suppose that St. Paul would permit himself, or be permitted by the common Father, to indulge in such Semitic affections, and use such Semitic words, and diffuse such a Semitic influence over the whole body of his teaching, as must needs be misleading to the rest of the world—the Western mind in particular? Does this modern

censor of past ages understand what he himself means when he says that "we have never been in a position to use the key which it offers to us?" But to proceed with the quotation:—

"We have used the word *Hebraise* for another purpose—to denote the exclusive attention to the moral side of our nature, to conscience, and to doing rather than knowing; so, to describe the vivid and figured way in which St. Paul within the sphere of religious emotion uses words, without carrying them outside it, we will use the word *Orientalise*. When Paul says, 'God hath concluded them all in unbelief, *that He might* have mercy upon all,' he Orientalises; that is, he does not mean to assert formally that God acted with this set design, but, being full of the happy and Divine end to the unbelief spoken of, he, by a vivid and striking figure, represents the unbelief as actually caused with a view to this end. But when the Calvinists of the Synod of Dort, wishing to establish the formal proposition that faith and all saving gifts flow from election, and nothing else, quote an expression of Paul's similar to the one we have quoted ('He hath chosen us,' they say, not because we were, but '*that we might* be holy and without blame before Him'), they go quite wide of the mark, from not perceiving that what the Apostle used as a vivid figure of rhetoric, they are using as a formal scientific proposition. When Paul Orientalises, the fault is not with him when he is misunderstood, but with the prosaic and unintelligent Western readers, who have not enough tact for style to comprehend his mode of expression."—P. 94.

This is a grave charge against the long, unbroken, and deep-thinking catena of expositors, who, from the first century downwards, have studied and expounded St. Paul's vivid and striking figures, and interpreted them into the plain facts of a systematic and consistent exhibition of the doctrines of grace. As to the points of theology which Mr. Arnold has chiefly in view, almost all classes of expositors have been agreed. With the exception of the thin stream of Pelagianism that a keen eye may trace through the earlier and later centuries, all classes of believers in Christianity have taken St. Paul's figures faithfully to correspond with realities shown him on the mount. In plainer words, the Christian Church, before as well as after its Reformation, believed that the words love, wrath, propitiation, reconciliation, life, death, resurrection, were used by him in their simple and literal meaning. Amidst endless differences as to the relations of the doctrines represented by these words, they were all at one in the confidence with which they received them as conveying doctrine and not mere figure; and we cannot consent to the hypothesis that the New Testament Scriptures were given

eighteen centuries before the true key for understanding them was imparted ; and certainly the kind of philosophy and the species of philosophers that offer us in this nineteenth century the *Clavis Paulina*, are not precisely such as to recommend the hypothesis.

We say the "Pauline key;" but, strictly speaking, the Orientalising affects all the writers of the Scripture, and all the speakers too, including Him who is the chief speaker. And where will this principle carry us ? Our Lord, in His deepest, most far-reaching discourses, and in those which had the least Judaic and the most universal meaning and application, used these kind of figures in illustration of this mystery. He spoke of the bread of life, of the blood of the new covenant, of laying down His life for the sheep, of giving Himself a ransom for many, of giving His flesh for the life of the world ; and without a figure of this kind scarce opened He His mouth. Are we, then, to assume that the presence of these figures Orientalises the doctrine of Atonement out of the region of systematic theology into the region of mystical, indeterminate, and unreal reverie ? Is it to be believed that the Supreme Oracle and Infallible Arbiter of Truth would utter one long series of misleading rhetorical metaphors on the subjects of most transcendent interest to man, on the subjects which by their importance make all other subjects insignificant, without a single word of warning, and without giving or promising the key to their interpretation ? He did, indeed, promise the key to their interpretation : His Holy Spirit enlightening the understandings of His Apostles—and one included whom as yet they knew not—and guiding them into all the truth. But then these expositors of Our Saviour's Orientalisms Orientalised even more than He ; that is, as we steadfastly believe, they clothed the doctrines of eternal truth in the vesture of sacred figure, which the Holy Ghost had chosen, and sanctified, and interpreted to them. But, like their Divine Master, they never failed to explain in simpler language what the Divine Inspirer had given them in parables. And thus the facts are explained by figures ; but the figure itself is fact.

But, it will be asked, are there not abundant instances of an Oriental style which must be translated into the sober element of Western thought ? Undoubtedly there is an abundant influence of Eastern figurative language everywhere apparent ; and no writer of the Scripture can be thoroughly understood by those who forget this. But, we maintain, the Scripture explains itself in all that pertains to essential

doctrine, never suffering what is vital in the truth to depend upon an isolated figure or class of figures. "He made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him," is a very Oriental sentence; but its meaning, both as to our sin being visited on Christ, and His righteousness obtaining righteousness for us, is sufficiently protected by other and plainer sayings. As to the examples which Mr. Arnold quotes, it is more easy to impute such a meaning to the words as he assigns to them than to justify the imputation. St. Paul does not represent the unbelief as caused in order that His mercy might reach all; the writer of such a criticism ought to know that "concluding in unbelief" does not mean "made unbelievers;" and, if he does not know it, our readers will. As to the other instance—that of the Calvinistic perversion of St. Paul—we see no reason for resorting to the Oriental canon, and, if we did, Mr. Arnold's interpretation would not be the result. God hath chosen us in Christ, that we might be holy; that St. Paul meant to say that, being holy and without blame, God chose us, may suit the scientific mind, but it does not suit the style of Scripture, which so far at least agrees with the Synod of Dort that our severance from the world into Christ, whether in the Divine thought or in the accomplished act, has for its object our being made holy in Him. These examples are ill chosen. But, generally speaking, it would be impossible to find any better than these; at any rate, among the paragraphs of St. Paul on which the theology depends.

"But he also Judaizes; and here his liability to being misunderstood by us Western people is undoubtedly due to a defect in the critical habit of himself and his race. A Jew himself, he uses the Jewish Scriptures in a Jew's arbitrary and uncritical fashion, as if they had a talismanic character; as if for a doctrine, however true in itself, their confirmation was still necessary, and as if this confirmation was to be got from their mere words alone, however detached from the sense of their context, and however violently allegorised or otherwise wrested. To use the Bible in this way, even for purposes of illustration, is often an interruption to the argument—a fault of style; to use it in this way for real proof and confirmation, is a fault of reasoning. An example of the first fault may be seen in the tenth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, and in the beginning of the third chapter: the Apostle's point in either place—his point that faith comes by hearing, and his point that God's oracles were true though the Jews did not believe them—would stand much clearer without their scaffolding of Bible quotation. An instance of the second fault is in the fourth chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians, where the Biblical argumentation by which the Apostle seeks to prove his case is as

unsound as his case itself is sound. How far these faults are due to the Apostle himself, how far to the requirements of those to whom he wrote, we need not now investigate. It is enough that he undoubtedly uses the letter of Scripture in this arbitrary and Jewish way; and thus Puritanism, which has only itself to blame for misunderstanding him when he Orientalises, may fairly put upon the Apostle himself some of its blame for misunderstanding him when he Judaises, and for Judaising so strenuously along with him."—P. 95.

It is very strange to find the blessed Apostle, whose whole life was spent in combating those who hid the Cross behind Jewish ceremonial, or linked it with abandoned ordinances, charged in this novel manner with building again that which he destroyed. Paul among the Judaisers! But there is something painful, as well as strange, in the style of attack which absolutely robs the Apostle of his right to teach and liberty to prophesy. We have but little patience for this patronising style of criticising the Apostle. If Mr. Arnold were one of those who sweep away the later Scriptures altogether, and go back to the words of Christ, or what of them can be sifted out of the heterogeneous mass of early tradition, we could understand all this. But he professes much admiration for the doctor of the Gentiles; gently corrects his brother sceptic for asserting that the day of Paul is well-nigh over, thinks that he has a long career of European influence before him, and intends by this book to explain the Apostle's mind better than he could have explained it himself. Mr. Arnold does, indeed, prove that he is a diligent and appreciating student of St. Paul; and that he reverences him to the utmost limit of what science will allow. We could quote some passages which show that he might have been a very able expositor of his doctrine. But it is not to be wondered at if we grow impatient when we hear the Apostle condemned for spoiling his New Testament argument by his Old Testament illustration, and for dishonouring the simplicity of his free Gospel by unworthy concessions to the ancient economy. Mr. Arnold's two examples are again singularly unfortunate: unfortunate in themselves, as there are no chapters in St. Paul's writings which more profoundly bring out the identity of spirit in the Old Testament and the New than those to which he refers; unfortunate in relation to the critic, for, like those formerly quoted, they belong to a certain order of passages which a superficial student is sure to cavil at, wresting them to his own confusion. St. Paul's glory was twofold as an expositor of the ancient Scriptures: he, more than any apostle, showed the transitory character

of the old dispensation and the superiority of the new; while, beyond any other, he has proved that there is nothing in the later economy which had not its germ, its type, symbolical or prophetic, in the older.

After all, the question is not of Paul's Orientalising or Hebraising, but of his authority as a writer in the Christian Church. Mr. Arnold and his school regard him as the most vigorous theologian to whom Christianity gave birth in the first century, whose miscellaneous writings must be received and studied just as any other early father's would be: as "Paul, who did not write scientific treatises, but had always religious edification in direct view, never set out his doctrine with a design of exhibiting it as a scientific whole, we must also find out for ourselves the order in which his ideas naturally stand, and the connection between one of them and the other, in order to arrive at the real scheme of his teaching, as compared with the schemes exhibited by Puritanism." How is it that, in all the critiques and expositions of St. Paul's system which our modern restorers of Christianity attempt, they do not hear what he himself persistently, from the beginning to the end of his writings, declares, that he spoke with a Divine authority, and could not be understood but by a spiritual discernment? His Gospel, too, was taught by the Lord Himself; he received his apostleship, including his offices both of preacher and teacher, not of man but of God; and his words were such as the Holy Ghost taught him. The fundamental principle of the modern criticism sweeps all this aside; and St. Paul is dealt with as if he had written with a strong convert feeling towards Christ, but with all his Jewish prejudices and Oriental wildness of figure still clothing him like a garment. Surely those whom Mr. Arnold addresses have a right to ask, before they listen to him or argue with him, what his real sentiments as to St. Paul's authority in the Church of Christ are. Till these are declared there is no common ground. Whatever sentiment, attributed by modern science to St. Paul, we may complain of will be defended by the Oriental or Judaising canon; and whatever doctrine we may point to as seemingly current throughout his writings will be rejected, as unscientific, by the same canons. Hence there is but little satisfaction in discussing any subject with these adversaries. We understand the position of Renan or Baur; we know also our opponents when we are disputing with a Calvinist over Rom. ix.: but it is hard to deal with one who is an enthusiastic votary of Paul the doctor, while, nevertheless, he

assumes that Paul's writings require for their exposition a new and most delicate key that modern science has to forge.

We must, having gone so far, make some remarks on a few terms that figure largely in these essays; such as righteousness, faith, identification with Christ, resurrection, original sin. Not that we shall discuss these grave subjects at any length: the utmost we can do is to point out some effects of a deplorable superficiality in our author's strictures on what he calls Protestant theology.

Mr. Arnold has some fine passages as to the Hebrew conception of righteousness; and his vindication of the design of all religion, as interpreted by science, is so beautifully written, that we cannot help wishing he could once catch a sight of the grandeur of a righteousness imputed, and plead for it in the same style. However, we must take him as we find him; and we find him determined to reject every kind of righteousness that is not the result of internal discipline. After dilating in a flippant style on the contract religion of Puritanism—a flippant style which is unworthy of Mr. Arnold and unjust to the glorious assemblage of Puritan divines—and on the doctrine of John Wesley concerning justification and sanctification, he triumphantly exclaims:—"It is manifest how unlike is this order of ideas to Paul's order, who starts with the thought of righteousness, and builds upon that thought his whole system." And then he proceeds to show that science has a more rational conception of things in view than can be attained by a system that offers a righteousness to our hopes and fears.

Now, it is quite true that St. Paul starts with the thought of righteousness, and builds his system upon it. But no man—scientific or otherwise—can take up the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians without seeing almost immediately that there is a righteousness lying at the foundation of the Apostle's system which is absolutely and altogether independent of man's merit, the grasping of which precedes that effort after righteousness in which man seeks "to serve God, to follow that central clue in our moral being which unites us to the universal order." According to Mr. Arnold, the "righteousness of God" which St. Paul sought was "an entire conformity, at all points, with the Divine moral order, the will of God, and, in consequence, a sense of harmony with this order, of acceptance with God." But in the Epistle to the Romans, which, as we shall presently see, our critic has always in view, a certain doctrine of God's righteousness is taught which lays a broad and sure foundation for the

establishment of man's righteousness. The Gospel preaches a righteousness of God which is declared in the propitiation effected by Christ's sacrificial blood, and obtained by faith in that propitiation. Without a single word of reference to "man's conformity with God," without a single glance at his entering again "into the moral order," the majestic paragraph declares that the righteousness of God is manifested in the atonement of Christ: His righteousness as the God who passed by the sins of previous ages, not visiting them with their due penalty, was vindicated; and His righteousness as the just God dealing with the ungodly as just, that is, as is afterwards explained, not reckoning their iniquities to them, was both accounted for and justified. It is utterly impossible to dislodge the Puritan from this text: it is the citadel and city of David; Mr. Arnold, and all the Philistines whom he patronises so much (for there is no more real Philistine than himself), may urge their assault for ever. There it remains: a righteousness which abides as the tranquil, immovable foundation of that other righteousness which is not brought to man, but to which man is raised. God's righteousness is for us, and it is also in us. If we can have the former, we may hope to have the latter. The two are inseparably united. And to us, it is simply amazing that any thoughtful reader can fail to perceive this doctrine in the Epistle to the Romans. That men deny the doctrine is another matter; and that we can very well understand. That they think it a thing incredible that God should provide in His Son made flesh a representative of mankind whose sorrow and death should be the repentance of the race and the expiation of all sin, is natural enough, only too natural. But that St. Paul should be quoted defiantly as teaching another doctrine, is to be explained only as one illustration of a general tendency of these times—to put its own imperious construction on everything. But does Mr. Arnold really so quote him? Let us hear: taking our departure from this analysis of the Epistle:—

"The first chapter is to the Gentiles. Its purport is: You have not righteousness. The second is to the Jews. Its purport is: No more have you, though you think you have. The third chapter announces faith in Christ as the one source of righteousness for all men. The fourth chapter gives to the notion of righteousness through faith the sanction of the Old Testament and of the history of Abraham. The fifth insists on the causes for thankfulness and exultation in the boon of righteousness through faith in Christ; and applies, illustratively, with this design, the history of Adam. The sixth chapter comes to the

all-important question: 'What is that faith in Christ which I, Paul, mean?'—and answers it. The seventh illustrates and explains the answer. But the eighth, down to the end of the twenty-eighth verse, develops and completes the answer. The rest of the eighth chapter expresses the sense of safety and gratitude which the solution is fitted to inspire. The ninth, tenth, and eleventh chapters uphold the second chapter's thesis—so hard to a Jew, so easy to us,—that righteousness is not by the Jewish Law, but dwell with hope and joy on a final result of things which is to be favourable to Israel."—P. 152.

Here the great third chapter is represented as teaching faith in Christ as the one source of righteousness for men. We mark at once an ambiguity here. Is Christ, or faith in Christ, the source of righteousness? According to his subsequent doctrine, as we shall see, this is not—as might be at first supposed—a slip of Mr. Arnold's untheological pen, unversed in the delicacies of Puritan theology. He really believes in both, after a fashion; and is quite consistent in holding the idea, however absurd it may seem, that faith in Christ is the source of all good in man. But afterwards it appears that man receives through faith in Christ a "boon of righteousness;" and here it is obvious that the writer unconsciously convicts himself. What is a boon but a free gift? And what *free gift* can there be for sinful man, in the nature of things, but the gift of pardon, or acceptance as righteous for the sake of another? "God hath made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him:" connecting this text with the passage in the Romans, how can it be said by anyone with a good conscience that St. Paul's idea of righteousness has nothing forensic in it?

The constant reference to the atonement of Christ's sacrifice does not trouble our critic. Suffice that St. Paul's conception of that sacrifice altogether excludes "the notion of *satisfying and appeasing an angry God's wrath.*" Very many thoughtful and elaborate attempts have been made by the divines of this school to explain the Apostle's doctrine in such a manner as to deprive it of every expiatory reference; but Mr. Arnold thinks he can improve upon them. At any rate he aims to preserve his originality. His method is positive and negative; that of giving a new definition of atonement, on the one hand, and that of satirising the ideas of those who hold the traditional view.

His theory of Atonement—or rather his theory of St. Paul's theory—is that Christ died to the law of self, parted with what men generally hold most precious and dear. This was

His testimony to righteousness; and, as this testimony was rendered necessary not by His own fault, but by ours, His death was a ransom. His "solemn and dolorous condemnation of sin does actually loosen sin's hold and attraction upon us who regard it—makes it easier for us to understand and love goodness, to rise above self, to die to sin." But is this the *boon*, the free grace, the unspeakable gift, the great design of the demonstration of God's righteousness in the death of Christ upon the cross? What a de-Orientalising of Paul's metaphor, and what a taming down of Paul's "vivid language," is this! To make it easier to understand and love goodness and die to sin, Mr. Arnold must read his Jowett and Reuss again.

The other method of vindicating the Apostle's doctrine of "unbloody sacrifice," is that of satirising the orthodox. Now, our author is a master of the art of quiet verbal flagellation; and all the more evidently master of it because he never loses his good temper and his good nature. But it is one thing to expose Millism and Miallism, and all the brood of degenerate Hellenists and Hebraisers; it is one thing to rout the Philistines, and write down the endless uncultured shams of the day; and it is quite another thing to travesty the sacred faith of multitudes of the highest saints and deepest thinkers of all Christian ages. We can find no words to express our displeasure at the style in which the "Puritan" doctrine of redemption is caricatured. Nothing would be easier than to quote these offensive words, and by simply quoting them enlist our readers' sorrow and indignation. But we feel an insuperable repugnance to the task.

Leaving the Calvinistic divines who are aggrieved to defend themselves if they think proper, we, whose theology is of that type which our common critic calls Arminian, must needs wonder that he does not treat us with a little more consideration. For nearly a century we Methodist divines have been writing and preaching—but, with the reverence that becomes the subject, and profound respect for the men we differ from—against some of the views which Mr. Arnold brands with Philistine scorn. We have been contending against the covenant that partitioned the race; against the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the believer, whether for his acceptance as a sinner or for his acceptance as a saint; we have been contending against Antinomianism in all its forms, grosser and more subtle, until we have laid ourselves open to the charge of work-mongering, Romanism, semi-Pelagianism, and what not. And now we find ourselves

mingled by our brilliant critic with the Puritans of all shades in one undistinguishing condemnation. True, we are not ashamed of our company; we reverence the departed Puritans and we love the living. We hold with them a common faith. But, after all, we should have been punished "with a difference." And John Wesley ought to have had more respect paid to his theology. Of course, we are grateful for the few words of praise which the critic condescends to spend upon his "genius for godliness," and so forth. But that is to us of comparatively little moment. What affects us is that our doctrine should be said to "rest, like the Calvinistic scheme, with all its weight, on the assertion of certain supposed proceedings on God's part, independent of us, our experience, and our will; and leads its recipients to look, in religion, not so much for an arduous progress on their own part, and the exercise of their own activity, as for strokes of magic, and what may be called a sensational character." This is not very graceful language; moreover, it is not true. Mr. Arnold is one of the most eloquent advocates of truth in art and criticism that our language boasts; but there is not the ring of truth about this. The Methodist doctrine, and the Methodist preaching, are not more earnest in bringing men to the acceptance of a righteousness dependent "on certain proceedings on God's part," than in urging on men the importance of obtaining Christian perfection, and of pursuing that perfection most earnestly in the triple way pointed out by St. John, of obedience, devotion, and charity. And in this we are one with the best Puritan theology. And, let us add, that in this respect—the necessity of the external and the internal righteousness—the Church of England has no difference with those whom Mr. Arnold so diligently separates from her. But we must return and proceed. Let us see how the Atonement becomes a reality in the experience of the man who beholds in it Christian testimony to moral order. After much else to the same purport, we read this account of Faith:—

"If ever there was a case in which the wonder-working power of attachment, in a man for whom the moral sympathies and the desire of righteousness were all-powerful, might employ itself and work its wonders, it was here. Paul felt this power penetrate him; and he felt also how, by perfectly identifying himself through it with Christ, and in no other way, could he ever get the confidence and the force to do as Christ did. He thus found a point in which the mighty world outside man, and the weak world inside him, seemed to combine for his salvation. The struggling stream of duty, which had not volume

enough to bear him to his goal, was suddenly reinforced by the immense tidal wave of sympathy and emotion. To this new and potent influence Paul gave the name of *faith*."—P. 130.

The impression produced by these words, which the cloudy sentences that follow do not, in any degree, remove, is that St. Paul created a new word, or rather used the old word in a different sense, and with a different meaning from any that had been attached to it before; in fact, that he gave the Old Testament faith in God the specific character of *identification with Christ*. Determined to find the whole of the Apostle's theology in this mystical fellowship with the Saviour, the writer boldly asserts that *faith*, the central term among St. Paul's instruments of godliness, means only the trust in an unseen power of goodness. That St. Paul uses the term without this specific sense wherever it was before applicable and usual, and did not invent a new term for his new principle, is accounted for by a reference to his tendency to Judaism, that is, to obtain, if possible, the sanction of the Hebrew Scriptures for his theological inventions. Now, let the reader, before he yields a moment's attention to this notion, trace in St. Paul's pages, or in a concordance, his use of the terms that express faith, and he will see how very inadequate a representation this is. Let it be remembered that we retain every word of Mr. Arnold's doctrine of faith as part of a greater whole of which he will not see the full proportions; that is to say, there is in the Christian system such a devotion to the Person of Christ as makes it a joy to study and to copy His example; such an enthusiasm for His holiness as lends an inexpressible vigour to the pursuit of sanctity and the abandonment of sin. But the student of St. Paul himself—not the student of Mr. Arnold's St. Paul—finds that this faith, in the unseen power of the example of Jesus, enters hardly at all into the Apostle's theory. The only, at any rate the strongest, reference to faith in Jesus contained in the Epistle to the Romans, and it is mainly that Epistle which is challenged in these essays, speaks of faith in His blood. Generally speaking, there, as elsewhere, the faith to which personal salvation is imparted, is either faith without an expressed object, or faith in the God who raised up Jesus from the dead. In the Epistle to the Galatians, we find the deepest and most impressive word concerning the wonders wrought by faith in the unseen Person of Jesus; in a passage standing alone, absolutely alone, in the bold energy with which it makes a personal appropriation of the love of Jesus. There the Apostle renounces his own independent life; and,

although his language does not amount to that *identification* with Christ of which our author so unscientifically speaks, it approaches as nearly to the language of identification as it could do without being unscientific. The Apostle declares that the life which he lived he lived by the faith of the Son of God. Here, then, if anywhere, is Mr. Arnold's doctrine. But let the reader mark in what a context of surroundings the words are embedded. "I am crucified with Christ," that is, to the claims of the Law, bearing the curse of the Law vicariously in the Redeemer; "and the life which I live I live by the faith of the Son of God, who *loved me, and gave Himself for me*"—words which have no meaning on Mr. Arnold's theory of faith, as they represent the faith as being exercised in the virtue of a love, and of the act of that love, exhibited in a time past, namely, at the time of the Great Sacrifice for sins.

It, perhaps, would be wasting time to prove at length that the object of faith, or rather the objects of faith, are the same in St. Paul's writings as they are in the Gospels and other Epistles. Our author is bent on showing that St. Paul, the pre-eminent doctor of Puritan Christianity, whilst he used the word in the same sense as the other writers, gave it further a mystical and occult sense which the earlier generations of Christians missed, but which now is made manifest to the men of scientific theology. Whatever St. Paul may be thought to say in harmony with the teachers of an objective faith from Augustine to Leighton and Wesley, will, of course, be set down to a Judaizing use of language; and we shall be calmly told that we have lost the real meaning of the Apostle while running after his apparent [meaning]. Dismissing this, then, we must be content to observe, upon the utterly unphilosophical, or, as the term goes, the unscientific application of the term faith to any habit or exercise of soul that leans only on an example of any fellow-conqueror, however great and holy. Emulation, enthusiasm, encouragement, stimulant, we can understand in this connection; but how faith can be exercised in One who has conquered, and left a conquering example, without Himself coming into the heart as a new power to inspire the strength of obedience, we find it hard to understand. This is not the place to expound Scripture; and our object is simply to set some on their guard who have been, and are still likely to be, ensnared by the plausibilities of this humanitarian theology. Hence we will only advert generally to the undeniable fact, that St. Paul never fails to attribute the power of his faith in Jesus to the presence of Jesus Himself, by His Spirit, within the soul.

The fact of a Divine strength imparted from above, which Methodists are most thankful to acknowledge as not less their faith than it is that of Calvinists, Mr. Arnold denounces as unscientific. Pelagianism, in every age, has denied it. But it is the doctrine of the entire Bible; and, so far from St. Paul rising from the dead, and renewing his youth, when it is sifted out from his writings, it seems to us that the removal of it would make St. Paul like another man—would, in fact, take away every element of his strength.

This leads to some remarks upon the strange doctrine of identification with Christ which plays so prominent a part in the pages of this book. It has been already hinted that the Apostle renounces the word and its idea; what Mr. Arnold means, but does not express, is the glory of St. Paul's theology. But the superficial doctrine taught here fatally errs by making the identification identical with the acting of a human faith; whereas, in the book which is dishonoured by such exposition, union with Christ is the result of the entrance of Christ by His Spirit into the being of the believer. It is, on the one hand, the indwelling of Christ—a fact which Mr. Arnold must not forget. It is, on the other, the dwelling of the believer in Christ—a fact which is more abundantly stated than any other, as describing the relation between the Christian and his Saviour. These two being true, the link between them is the idea of *union with Christ*, "one spirit with Him." These three elements in the great truth are sustained by so many passages in St. Paul's writings, that they may be said to be of their very essence. But the identification with Christ, of which our author speaks so eloquently, and in language which has so perilous a resemblance to the truth, has no place in Scripture. It is not the Christ of the New Testament, it is certainly not St. Paul's Christ, who has died to sin, that we might copy Him in dying to sin.

In the doctrines which Mr. Arnold repudiates and quietly despises there is harmony and scientific consistency. But where is the philosophy of making faith the instrument of an identification of one being with another: and how can the confidence that another has done what he ought to do give us the same power? If we are allowed to introduce into our theory the blessed truth that He in whom we believe is God, and has Divine access to our spirits, and that our faith, the strength of our human hearts' trust lifted to Him and His power, joins us to Him, by bringing to us His personal spirit, then we reach the great secret of a might that can accomplish all things; or, to use the language of the much-

travestied Apostle, "We can do all through Christ strengthening us;" "Not we live, but Christ liveth in us." We feel quite confident of this, that there is more science in this view than the other, apart from any Divine authority in the teaching. The things of religion are, indeed, not judged of science, especially of *this* science: but we may fearlessly make our appeal to true philosophy, and ask whether it is not in harmony with the soundest reasoning upon God's works, to expect that He should come down to lift His creatures up to Himself, rather than leave them to struggle upward under the sole inspiration of an enthusiastic feeling for the goodness of another. Mr. Arnold says that science knows nothing about Christ being the Divine Logos, the Second Person of the Trinity; "but that the Christ of the Bible follows the universal moral order and the will of God, without being let and hindered, as we are, by the motions of private passion and by self-will: this is evident to whoever can read the Bible with open eyes. It is just what any criticism of the Gospel-history, which sees that history as it really is, tells us; it is the scientific result of that history." How is it, then, that so many men, imbued with these scientific principles, oscillating between the two synonyms, "moral order of the universe" and "God"—men, we mean, who are really Mr. Arnold's teachers, though he speaks as if he had learnt of no man—otherwise read the Gospel narratives? These men, whose instinct and spirit we discern throughout the pages of this book, come to another conclusion—some of them to a very different conclusion indeed. They say that it is unscientific to take the testimony of Jesus Himself to His own freedom from sin; that the assurances of Paul and others—some of whom never saw Him, whilst others never saw Him save through eyes swimming with the tears of blind adoration—must be mistrusted; that many features of the Redeemer's character are harsh and, to say the least, suspicious—very far indeed from "mildness and sweet reasonableness." But our critic finds everything scientific that suits his deeply-sentimental gospel, and everything unscientific that is not in harmony with it. Whatever elevates man is true to him, and whatever brings God down to man is false.

Our author seems to be conscious of another element of weakness in his system, viz., that St. Paul's long "lists" of sins to be shunned and virtues to be cultivated have but a slight connection with the revealed character of Jesus. If faith is dying with Him, and enables us to die to all kinds of sin because and as He died to them, then for our encourage-

ment and inspiration we ought to be able to look at this great Pattern of victory over sin and achievement of holiness at all points of our own conflict and effort. Accordingly, we read the following sentences, which are first written in unmodified style:—

“Christ died to every self-willed impulse, blindly trying to assert itself, without respect of the universal order. You (says Paul to his disciple) are to do the same. Never mind how various and multitudinous the impulses are—impulses to intemperance, concupiscence, covetousness, pride, sloth, envy, malignity, anger, clamour, bitterness, harshness, unmercifulness, die to them all and to each as it comes! Christ did. If you cannot, your attachment, your faith, must be one that goes but a very little way. In an ordinary human attachment, out of love to a woman, out of love to a friend, out of love to a child, you can suppress quite easily, because by sympathy you become one with them and their feelings, this or that impulse of selfishness which happens to conflict with them, and which hitherto you have obeyed. *All* impulses of selfishness conflict with Christ’s feelings—He showed it by dying to them all; if you are one with Him by faith and sympathy, you can die to them also. Then, secondly, if you thus die with Him, you become transformed by the renewing of your mind, and rise with Him. The law of the spirit of life which is in Christ becomes the law of your life also, and frees you from the law of sin and death. You rise with Him to that harmonious conformity with the real and eternal order, that sense of pleasing God who trieth the hearts, which is life and peace, and which grows more and more till it becomes glory. If you suffer with Him, therefore you shall also be glorified with Him.”

In our comment on this passage we shall leave Mr. Arnold, and many others who hold a better faith than he, behind us; but we shall have the best thought of Christendom in our company. It is not true that St. Paul represents Christ as dying to sins in detail, or as dying to sin in any sense that involves His putting away anything that adhered to Him through His alliance with our nature. In all that belongs to our Saviour’s mediatorial interposition—from His incarnation down to His presentation of His sacred Person before the Throne—He was not merely without sin, but “separate from sinners.” This was tested by all the strength of temptation, and it was found to be so—“tempted in all points like as we are, yet *without sin*”—that is, in all those inexpressible temptations which, as the sinless and impeccable Mediator, He could endure, which might assault Him as being without sin or the power of sinning—He knows our weakness and can succour us; not, indeed, by sending the specific help that His own experience in every case of assault teaches Him that we need,

but by sending down the help of His omnipotent Spirit to enable us to attain through victory what He, by the eternal necessity of His Divine-human personality, *retained*—a sinless victory over sin. There are many things in this book which offend our Christian instincts and tastes, even more than they offend our doctrinal convictions, that is, in which we are more sensitive to the offence. But nothing more wounds our Christian feeling than this kind of identification—whatever the word may mean—between the believer and Christ. It were easy to show that the Apostle's words never even look that way. The great Messianic graces of the "Obedience"—perfect self-sacrifice in the positive aspect, and perfect submission to the will of the Father, the fountain of redemption, in the negative aspect—are set before us for our example; and there the example of Christ, strictly speaking, ends. All the graces which we labour and pray and watch for are exhibited in their perfection in Him. He shows them to us in the great result, not in the process of their attainment. It is a most unhealthy, and other than elevated, view of Christianity that brings the Saviour's example into continual contact with the details of our contest and duty. It is not the style of the Apostles, though it is a necessity of the kind of Christianity that we find exemplified in this book, thus to bring down Christ from above. It is a notion of Christ's relation to us which springs from a false fundamental conception of Christianity. It is a refined combination of Nestorianism and Pelagianism, which, however, neither Nestorius nor Pelagius would have recognised. Nestorius would not have acknowledged it, for His Son of God allied to a mortal man was indeed Divine, whereas the being who saves man in this modern theology is an abstraction without attributes and without a name. Pelagius would not have accepted it, for it affects a language of sacrificial mystical union that was intolerable to him after rejecting the true doctrine of atonement.

It has been said that Mr. Arnold seems conscious of a flaw in his argument here. Hence we read—

"But Christ's obeying God and not pleasing Himself culminated in His death on the cross. All through His career, indeed, Christ pleased not Himself and died to sin; but so smoothly and so inevitably, as we have before said, did He always appear to follow that law of the moral order which to us it costs such effort to obey, that only in the very wrench and pressure of His violent death did any pain of dying, any conflict between the law of the flesh and the law of the Spirit in Christ become visible. But the Christian needs to find in Christ's dying to sin a fellowship of suffering and a conformity of death.

Well, then, the point of Christ's trial and crucifixion is the only point in His career where the Christian can palpably touch what he seeks. In all dying there is struggle and weakness, but only in His crucifixion can we see, in Christ, place for struggle and weakness. That self-sacrificing obedience of Christ's whole life, which was summed up in this great, final act of His crucifixion, and which is palpable as sacrifice, obedience, dolorous effort, only here is, therefore, constantly regarded by Paul under the figure of this final act, as is also the believer's conformity to Christ's obedience. The believer is crucified with Christ when he mortifies by the Spirit the deeds of unrighteousness; Christ was crucified when He pleased not Himself and came to do not His own will but God's."—P. 145.

This is a striking sentence, and borders on the expression of a most profound and important theological principle. Christ's great obedience was one and indivisible; it was not a series of acts, but one undivided whole; and without doubt it was in the dolorous passion that the submission of our Saviour and Pattern was outwardly most conspicuous. But we have no reason to think that St. Paul made the crucifixion the figure of Christ's whole sacrificial obedience, or the figure of the believer's obedience unto holiness. Of the former we fail to find any trace. The Redeemer's death is sometimes, indeed, referred to as the limit of His obedience, but only when the exaltation is made its counterpart. He humbled Himself unto death, and therefore was highly exalted. But, generally speaking, and in the great majority of instances in which it is referred to, the passion and death are introduced with especial allusion to the claim and curse of the Law, and the redemption of men's souls; and when the believer is said to die with Christ, the idea of submission is scarcely ever included; certainly it is never the exclusive idea. "I am crucified with Christ," in the Epistle to the Galatians, cannot be understood, save on the principle that the Apostle, or rather the believer, shares in some way the benefit of our Saviour's propitiatory death "to the Law." But, passing over this, as having been already dwelt upon to some extent, we would remark that there is a strange inconsistency between the two theories which we have quoted. According to the one, the contemplation of Christ dying in detail to sin gives faith the power to die also to sin, by putting it away; according to the other, the only dying to sin which in Christ can be studied, or rendered available for human thought and imitation, is the crucifixion.

This leads us to one of the last terms that we have to consider—*resurrection*. According to Mr. Arnold, *calling, justification, sanctification*, are terms which have been wrongly

made essential in Pauline theology. The terms which should have been popular in the creed and in the heart of Christian people are, *dying with Christ, resurrection from the dead, growing into Christ*. The whole paragraph in which this startling paradox is set forth is well worth careful study; indeed it is one of those sentences which here and there suggest that our critic is a good theologian spoiled. We sympathise with him in his desire to give the latter trilogy its due importance. We believe that, rightly viewed, and rightly applied, they would prove an answer to many objections, and a safeguard against many theological errors. But they must be rightly viewed. Mr. Arnold's fine generalisation will not sustain the test. Granted that "dying with Christ" is what he intends, we must demur to his application of "rising from the dead," which, in Phil. iii. 11, the passage he refers to, cannot by any sophistication be referred to any event in the present life; and then the last expression, "growing into Christ," is marred for the writer's use by the fact that it is limited to a growth of the whole body in its "solidarity," as the phrase is. Now the words that are to displace *calling, justification, and sanctification*—which it seems treason to think of displacing, even in theory—ought to refer, like these words, to the believer, to the individual believer, and to the individual believer in the present life. The three that do duty in these pages belong to the believer, to the Church, and to the bodies of the saints. But this we do not dwell upon; if Mr. Arnold has not chosen the right passages, his doctrine is a sound one. In a certain sense the union with Christ, as crucified, is release from the sentence of the Law, in virtue of Him whose release includes the believer's; the regenerate soul is the living evidence of the risen Christ's indwelling; and the Christian life in its fulness and perfection cannot be more tenderly and more truthfully defined than as a growth up into Christ—a growth in life which is also a sinking into death—the concurrent processes of advancement in good and declining from evil—death in life and life in death. What we really demur to is the sacrificing the *resurrection of the dead* to this beautiful view of the Christian religion.

Mr. Arnold is something of a Gnostic, as certainly as, perhaps more certainly than, the enemies of his culture are Philistines. Now and then he gives strange hints of other deadly heresies, even of Manicheism—but scarcely of this, for he would be more ready to believe in the eternal extinction of evil than in its eternal necessity—and here he is like a semi-Christian philosopher of the second century. His

enmity to the resurrection is not the result of his theory of St. Paul's true Christianity, it is the product of an independent principle: it is, in short, a scientific enmity. But St. Paul, his doctor, stands in the way; the Apostle himself did not find it harder to kick against the pricks than the assailants of his doctrine of a veritable resurrection do. And his present critic is not one of those who resort wildly to the expedient of challenging the genuineness of everything that they do not like in the Apostle's writings. He accepts his many testimonies to the resurrection; but invents a new theory to account for them. Orientalising will hardly suffice here, for the figures are too strangely like fact to be figurative. Judaising will not of itself explain all; for the ancient Jewish faith, and the ancient Jewish scriptures, were not very clear and very distinct upon this point. But something must be done. First, and before announcing the theory, the way is paved for it, as usual, by an assault, whether just or unjust, upon the orthodox. Hence we are told that sensible and candid Biblical critics are in the habit of teaching that Christ's bodily resurrection, in the sense of a physical miracle, is the "central object of St. Paul's thoughts and the foundation of all his theology." Now, this is a vehement exaggeration in any case; what Biblical critics are in the habit of saying is this, that the resurrection of Christ is made by St. Paul the demonstration that He who raised Himself from the dead was very God, that His resurrection was the fulfilment of many promises, that it is the sun of a universal evidence in the firmament of revelation, and the pledge of the resurrection of His saints. But that he makes it the centre of his thoughts and the foundation of his theology, is not exactly true. And it is certainly not true that we of the great Puritan error have so interpreted the Apostle. Like him, we have thought it a thing not incredible that God should continue for ever the integral man in being, and adapt His future dwelling-place to the fact of His combined existence, and His composite being to His future existence. Moreover, we have thought that it was not simply matter of Pauline theology; but that Our Lord Himself has obviated all doubt, or hesitation, by as express declarations on this subject as He uttered on any.

Another malicious hint we find in the reference to Romans viii. and ix., where a very early Puritan altered the text, "Christ died and lived," into "Christ died and rose again and revived." Supposing the change had been made, how frivolous to make such an allegation as this in the face of so many

other passages; and how uncritical, since the very interpolation would establish the fact of a general spread of the Puritanical doctrine of the resurrection at a time when that general acceptance is necessarily an argument of truth. This is followed by the last precursor of the new theory. St. Paul's "*mature* theology, as the Epistle to the Romans exhibits it," is inconsistent with the physical and miraculous aspect of the resurrection. Now, the Epistle here spoken of was one of the earliest of the Apostle's writings; and the idea of his maturer theology would be more in keeping with some letters written at the close of his life. In those letters—written to Timothy and Titus—he speaks of the resurrection with as much clearness as when writing to the Corinthians, denouncing as heretics of no common order those who asserted that "the resurrection was past already." This, however, leads to the new theory: St. Paul had an esoteric, however unconsciously esoteric, doctrine:—

"Not for a moment do we deny that in Paul's earlier theology, and notably in the Epistles to the Thessalonians and Corinthians, the physical and miraculous aspect of the resurrection, both Christ's and the believer's, is primary and predominant. Not for a moment do we deny that, to the very end of his life, after the Epistle to the Romans, after the Epistle to the Philippians, if he had been asked whether he held the doctrine of the resurrection in its physical and miraculous sense, as well as in his own spiritual and mystical sense, he would have replied with entire conviction that he did. Very likely it would have been impossible to him to imagine his theology without it. But,

"Below the surface stream, shallow and light,
Of what we *say* we feel—below the stream,
As light, of what we *think* we feel—there flows
With noiseless current strong, obscure and deep,
The central stream of what we feel indeed;"

and by this alone are we truly characterised. Paul's originality lies in the effort to make the significance of all the processes, however mystical, of the religious life, palpable even to the intellect, with a view of strengthening, in this way, their hold upon us and their command of all our nature. Sooner or later he was sure to be drawn to treat the process of resurrection with this endeavour. He did so treat it; and what is original and essential in him is his doing so."—P. 142.

We have reserved this point, and this quotation, for the last, because it most fully reveals what is the essential weakness and worthlessness of that estimate of St. Paul's theology which our critic has formed for himself, and would impose upon the Christian world. We say impose upon the Christian world; for this essay comes before us with an oracular tone

as if it propounded a *novum organum* for inductive theological science. The writer is not thoughtfully and modestly suggesting here and there a few modifications; he is not pleading for the toning down of a few asperities in Puritan formula; he is not proposing some conciliatory compromise with the stiff reluctance of the present generation of St. Paul's sceptical readers. He is aiming at nothing less than the recasting of all dogmatic theology. There is no creed, confession, or formulary now extant that would not have the amending hand upon it from the beginning to the end. But what are the recommendations which Mr. Arnold brings to enforce his claims as the reformer of theology—that is, in the present case, of Pauline theology? What sympathy, insight, or knowledge has he of which St. Paul is the object? Very little indeed of either. He will have no doctrine of Apostolic inspiration; he does not admit that the Protestant doctor has any definite scheme of truth; he does not take it for granted that we have anywhere the veritable sentiments of the teacher who instructs the world; nay, he does not, finally, permit us really to think that that teacher knew himself what his own sentiments were. If Mr. Arnold really holds to the conviction which he hints at in his poetical quotation, we have not overstated the force of his destructive criticism. How can we be sure that the favourite watchwords "dying with Christ, rising with Christ, growing with Christ," were St. Paul's real thoughts? How do we know that these were "the central stream of what he thought indeed"? How can we be assured that he thought indeed anything that he ever said?

From all such expositors of the holy Apostle, we are, by himself, commanded to "turn away."

LITERARY NOTICES.

The Psalms : their History, Teachings, and Use. By William Binnie, D.D. London : Nelson and Sons.

THIS volume is not an addition to the abundant commentaries on the Psalms ; but aims at the supply of what has been lacking, at least in English literature—a theological introduction to the Psalms. It is, in fact, an expansion of the introductory essay that we usually find in the preface of the commentaries. So far as this portion of the Bible can be understood without appealing to the text itself, this work of Dr. Binnie will be found very serviceable ; it is thoroughly Catholic, and yet Evangelical. The author has availed himself of the aid of teachers of all confessions ; and, when a truly orthodox writer does this, the effect on his work will be sure to manifest itself.

There is something artistic and symmetrical in the scheme of the volume. The First Book deals with the genesis and development of the Psalter itself ; the Third Book rather briefly traces the history of the ancient and modern use of the Psalms ; the Second Book and middle portion is occupied with the theology of this portion of revealed truth.

The First Book contains a very good arrangement of the usual manner ; but would have been more useful if the Hebrew had been introduced occasionally to rivet distinctions that can scarcely be remembered without it. The growth of the Book in the ancient Church is a fine theme, and is here well handled ; the necessity of invading the province of the remaining books is felt, but involves a difficulty that is got over without much embarrassment. We must give an extract which will show the character of the work, and refresh our memory of the *Old Hundred*. "Every devout reader will remember Psalms of the character anticipated. The middle of the Psalter derives a peculiar brightness from a constellation of them ; the decade, I mean, which closes with the Hundredth Psalm. With perhaps one or two exceptions, all the ten, from the ninety-first to the hundredth, belong to the prophetic order. They are Messianic in the sense of celebrating the kingdom of Christ, although not Messianic in the narrower sense of celebrating His Person. They soar above the level of the Old Testament economy, several of them carrying the soul forward and upward to a state of things such as the Apostolical Church itself

never saw. Dr. Delitzsch has, with much felicity, entitled them *Apocalyptic Psalms*—some of them I should prefer to call *Songs of the Millennium*. The Hundredth Psalm, for instance, how grandly does it anticipate the Millennial time, and summon all the nations to unite in the high praises of the Lord! After giving the well-known version, the writer adds: "This noble version, *Old Hundred*, is, I believe, the most ancient now in common use in our language, as it is certainly one of the very best; faithful to the original, and yet full of grace and strength. It was first printed in the Psalm book published for the English exiles at Geneva in 1561; and is believed to have been written by William Kethe, a native of Scotland, who joined the exiles at Geneva in 1556. From an allusion in Shakespeare, the Psalm in this version, and the well-known melody named after it, would appear to have been a great favourite in Queen Elizabeth's time, as they are among ourselves." The question, when and by whom the Five Books of the Psalms were collected and arranged, gives occasion to a dissertation that sums up the entire bearings of the final editing of the Psalms in a masterly style. The Acrostic Psalms are illustrated in a manner that is original, and will, at any rate, prove instructive to the reader.

On the whole, we have been much interested in this book. Not that we think it perfect; it seems to us that the chronological order might have been exhibited at a glance by some skilfully drawn-up tables. But, on the whole, the student will find it a most useful thing to make himself familiar with this part of the volume.

The theology of the Psalms is laid open with considerable fulness. It is enough on this subject to say that the author shuns the great error of excluding Christ; and, more than that, he shuns the equally great error of limiting the theology of the Psalms to the level of an inferior dispensation. If it were possible he errs in the opposite extreme; but that is not possible. There is nothing in the full revelation, which was not either taught expressly, or so taught in type and figure, that the meaning could not be hid from the eye of faith. The teaching of the Psalms concerning sin is nobly exhibited. So here: "It is not meant, of course, that the doctrine of original sin is anywhere formally stated or reasoned out in this book. The Psalms are not doctrinal treatises. There is no express mention either of the first transgression, or of the manner in which the fortunes of the race were affected by that act of apostasy. Curiously enough, the name of Adam is scarcely once mentioned in the Old Testament after the first five chapters of Genesis, so that we need not marvel at its absence from the Psalms. But the whole substance of the doctrine of inborn depravity finds here an articulate echo. Whatever else God's people failed generally to understand and receive, there was plainly no failure either to perceive the drift of His testimony regarding our fallen state, or to acknowledge its truths. It is remarkable, that when the Apostle sets himself, in the Epistle to the Romans, to collect and exhibit the Bible texts which bear witness to the lost and helpless condition of mankind, by reason of sin, the proofs he cites are, with one exception,

taken from the Psalms. The Psalms are the voice of the Church, as well as the voice of God's Spirit. Borrowing the language of a well-known text, one might say that, in the case supposed, 'the Spirit beareth witness along with the spirit of God's people.' Double weight attaches, therefore, to the affirmations made in the Psalms respecting our sinful and lost condition; for in them the truth is affirmed by the concurrent testimony, first of the Spirit of inspiration speaking in the holy Psalmists, and then of the innumerable multitude of the godly who, during so many generations, have appropriated the confessions of the Psalmists, and addressed them to God as the expression of their own heartfelt conviction."

Book III. contains some very curious, interesting, and valuable information. But we must forbear from illustration. On the whole, we cordially recommend Dr. Binnie's volume as a useful introductory manual to every student of the Book of Psalms.

Die Heilige Dreieinigkeit Gottes [The Holy Trinity]. By Dr. L. Schöberlein. Hanover: Meyer.

AN important little treatise, which will be instructive to everyone who thoughtfully reads it; indeed, none can read it but thoughtfully, as it is the work of a deep-thinking divine, who has the art of stimulating his readers' patient thought. After some passages of introduction, tending to exalt the importance of the subject, Dr. Schöberlein establishes *what* it is that the Christian Church teaches concerning a trinity; and this gives him occasion carefully to define in what senses the terms *nature* or *essence* and *person* are used, and how differently from the usual application of them. He then notices the common and superficial objection, that this doctrine contains essential contradiction; and shows that the economical Trinity of the redeeming work leads of necessity to the ontological Trinity, and cannot be understood on any Arian or Sabellian principles. He then approaches the mystery a little more speculatively, in a style which is more affected in Germany than in England, though we are not without our speculatists on the Trinity *ad intra*. He finds in the essence of God, which is love—and, therefore, personal, since an impersonal love is a *contradictio in adjecto*—all that is necessary for the recommendation of the doctrine to true thinkers. Absolute love must have an absolutely equal object for its subject: it thus apprehends in an eternal act a being equal to itself—the Son. And, inasmuch as the Father in the Son, and the Son in the Father, are conscious of each other as the one Divine Essence, the hypostasis of the Holy Ghost arises. Without this Trinity in God, the creation of the world would be an act of necessity: as it is, God being for ever satisfied in Himself, the creation of all things is an act of *free love*.

Such are the views which will be found wrought out in vigorous style. It is idle to say that such speculations are fruitless and idle: idle they are not, however fruitless. Nor, indeed, are they without result, since multitudes of profound thinkers have found in such

thoughts solid nourishment, and no slight defence against the incursion of thoughts that are worse than idle and fruitless. This tract—for it is little more—would make a good text-book for a thorough study of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity as unfolded in Christian philosophy. Its earlier part is thoroughly good, and its latter part is eminently suggestive and profitable.

John; or, The Apocalypse of the New Testament. By Philip J. Desprez, D.D. Longmans.

M. DESPREZ says truly that the study of the Apocalypse will have an additional interest imparted to it by the circumstance that it has been selected to be read in the revised table of Lessons for the season of Advent. There can be no question that much impetus will be given to the pulpit use of this code; and the pulpit, after all, rules the theological literature of the day. Every controversy in religious matters stimulates preaching in the direction of that controversy; and, conversely, every topic that is much handled in the pulpit is sure to employ many pens.

We can hardly understand, however, on what principle he calls the Apocalypse a much-neglected book. Relatively, perhaps, to the Gospels, and some of the Epistles, it has been comparatively, less expounded; but, taken as one of the books of the Bible, it has its share of attention. Modern Millenarianism has sent a thousand explorers with keen zest to its mysteries, and not a few of them have gone into print with their theories and discoveries. Whatever is here said as to the perversion of the book, we heartily assent to; and add M. Desprez to the number of the perverters. He is a learned, sincere, and vigorous thinker; and his book contains many very valuable remarks. Yet he has, however unintentionally, perverted the meaning of the book, and done something to lead others into perversion.

Not so much, however, as he would have done, had not certain preliminary drawbacks from his influence ostentatiously obtruded themselves. For instance, this volume sets out by retracting the author's former opinions on some leading points of Apocalyptic interpretation. Those who have read his former writings will be surprised, perhaps grieved, to find that he has been compelled, however reluctantly, to abandon his opinion that the destruction of Jerusalem, and the swiftly following advent of the Messiah, were the historical landmarks of the beginning of the book. Now, he dismisses the idea that historical events enter at all into the book, which contains a sincere, but visionary, delineation of events that St. John, in common with many of his countrymen, supposed to be impending; and which the same St. John sent out into the world under the impulse of his own enthusiastic spirit, but without any help from the Holy Ghost. All this confronts us in the preface; and there is much afterwards that is more startling. But these words are enough to inspire a serious distrust. We have had enough, more than enough, of hypothesis; and it seems hard to

be obliged to watch the vacillations and variations of one who is gradually coming to his true thought. It is bad enough to have critical recensions published, revoked, or improved upon; but that is a necessary evil. In the exposition of such a solemn portion of Scripture as the Book of Revelation, it is a very different matter: we have a right to complain when a respected author makes the public, makes ourselves, privy to all the processes of error and correction. It is like making us the patient on whom he makes his experiments. M. Desprez should spend more time, and thought, and profound meditation, and publish nothing, on such a subject at least, as shall be capable of a thorough subversion. At any rate, the reader who might hope, from some announcements already made, that M. Desprez would help him out of some of his difficulties, will feel this to be a preliminary discouragement.

Again, the writer has gone to such extravagant lengths as to prejudice the sincere inquirer against him. We have read this volume with much pain on this account. The reputation of the writer, and the dedication to Dean Stanley, naturally suggested the hope of an attempt, however free, to reconcile the exposition of the Apocalypse with theology and ecclesiastical history as received by Anglican formularies and traditions. But there is no restraint of any kind remaining; it might seem that the last vestige was renounced. The last of the Apostles, the recorder of our Saviour's final promise to His chosen preachers and writers, is capable of uttering a series of incoherent and irreverent rhapsodies concerning heavenly scenes, and the intercourse of heaven and earth, which, after the interval of a generation, he still allows to be circulated in his name, and with the superscription of his holy Master upon it. This is totally incredible, and the fact that a writer could propound or sanction such a notion seems to us a disqualification for his task.

We prefer not to enter upon any examination of the attack made upon the detail of the book, and the general doctrine of the Second Coming, which is boldly, and with something like a flourish, swept away, as the great mistake of the New Testament. Of course the author will regard such treatment on our part as unfair, and as a renunciation of the truth or evasion of difficulty. But we are conscious of a most unaffected difficulty in dealing with the criticisms and opinions of a book that treats the Author of the Christian faith as He is here treated. Take the following quotation:—

“It did not occur to him to ask how they should believe in one of whom they had not read; the imputation of an approaching end of all things rendering all teaching, except oral teaching, unnecessary. To this it may be added, that Jesus neither Himself committed to writing, nor took any means to preserve, His genuine teachings in that form, so as to avoid the errors of memory on the part of those who have handed them down to us, and the corruptions of time and oral tradition. The more this fact is considered, the more inexplicable it will appear on any other ground than this, that *neither He nor His Apostles saw any neces-*

sity for so doing, because they believed that the world was coming to an end in their own time. Had Jesus entertained the idea that the Christian Church was to last even five hundred, to say nothing of eighteen hundred years, during which time every doctrine and precept was to become the subject of angry dispute and violent controversy, *nothing could excuse or explain His conduct in not Himself providing for the genuineness and the infallibility of His teachings, which should remain to future ages as an authoritative standard of faith.* It is well known that most of the troubles which disfigure the history of Christianity are traceable to this omission, and that the religious world would not have been distilling its agony of bloody sweat for the last eighteen hundred years had it been assured with certainty upon such points as the Trinity, the supremacy of the Pope, transubstantiation, and the Divinity of Christ. It is difficult, moreover, on any other supposition than that of the expectation of an immediate end of all things which superseded the necessity of written documents, to account for the late date of composition attributed to the Evangelical histories, and to conceive that the publication of narratives upon the truthfulness of which our eternal interests are thought to depend, should be deferred to a period sufficiently distant from the events related, to detract from their credit." Then we have Mr. Mill quoted, and the strain runs on with very little variation.

M. Desprez might as well write down a long list of the difficulties which appear on the face of nature, and throughout the moral government of a God whom he as yet supposes to exist, and, having summed them up with a note of interrogation at the end of each, ask how these things are to be accounted for. We do not pretend to be answering the arguments brought against the doctrine of Christ's sudden return; those arguments are so ordered and discussed by the writer that it would take a good volume to dispose of them. We are simply putting in a bar at the outset; raising, not indeed a technical objection—nothing could be less technical than our demur—but a preliminary objection that is to us insuperable. The Holy Scriptures ought to be reverently handled by one of the ministers pledged and set apart for their defence and exposition. The dignity and authority of Jesus, the oracle of truth, ought to be pre-eminently sacred to one who is ordained to minister in His service. But M. Desprez outrages, as a Christian minister, the decorum which ought to shield the Holy Name from such language as we have quoted and italicised. How can a minister of the Church of England reconcile such language with his fealty to his order or fidelity to his vows? To have written this book honourably, M. Desprez should have renounced his position in the Anglican community, and joined the nearest congregation of Unitarians. At least, this is our judgment; and we confess that this conviction disqualifies us for entertaining with as much respect and tolerance as we should otherwise feel the disquisitions of one whom we have in time past favourably known.

Before closing our observations we have another thing to notice.

This also refers to the pernicious tendency of the book, altogether apart from its argument. The writer is working in a wrong direction. Not even the Dean of Westminster's name will avail to give currency to the destructive views here propounded. They go too far for any good purpose. Better to renounce the Scriptures altogether, and fall back upon natural religion, than to deal with them in this fashion. Towards the conclusion of his labours, M. Desprez quietly sums up, with all the confidence of a triumphant generalisation, the results of the evils brought on the Christian Church and Christian Faith by the erroneous notion of the second coming of Christ. The matter and the style of his summaries, generally, are offensive and repellent; they have the air of convicting all schools of theology, from the beginning, of egregious error. Every modern Rationalist, of any pretensions, gives us, more or less, the same impression: it seems to be a necessity of their position. Assailing the traditional theology of all ages, they must needs assume, virtually if not actually, a new inspiration of their own. And this gives an unspeakably grotesque character to the lucubrations of such men as Mr. Voysey, M. Desprez, and others.

The passage we here epitomise is a remarkable instance in point. Our author, whose principle tends to upset every article of faith, charges the doctrine of Christ's return with producing doctrinal confusion. "Of the theological differences caused by this anachronous postponement it may be said that their name is legion, each equally false and equally at variance with each other." We have no space or inclination to criticise the grammar of this and similar sentences, their meaning is all that concerns us here. *Election* is only the deliverance of a chosen few out of the world at the then impending advent of the Messiah; the mistake, therefore, as to a postponed coming has engendered Calvinism. Moreover, effectual calling and perseverance are very simple matters as referring to conduct to be decided almost immediately; and "the invidious theory of predestination" (strange title!) "might have attained less notoriety had it been understood that the *vessels of wrath* and the *vessels of mercy* spoken of by St. Paul comprehended those only whose destruction or redemption was then *drawing nigh*." So the great contest against the present evil world has been needlessly exasperated by forgetting that that world passed away with the age of the Apostles.

So also, of course, the prince of this world has been a sufferer from the general error:—"The sins laid to the charge of the prince of this world—that most convenient scapegoat of recalcitrant humanity—might have been fewer had the reflection suggested itself that Satan was supposed to be *the god of the world that then was*, but that his powers of temptation would be crippled and himself bound in the coming age." As if the enemy were now bound! And in this style the writer spins his sentences, like one who has found a panacea for all the ailments of theology, or, rather, like one who has found the secret malady that explains all the manifest ailments, for he does not profess to cure anything. Missionary exertions are convicted of being without the essen-

tial element they had in the beginning. The whole ends with the strange sentence—very strange from an ordained minister of the Church of England and a friend of Dean Stanley—that “to assert a permanence for the Church beyond the term occupied by Apostolic men is to create a state of things not contemplated by its original founders, and foreign to the conceptions of the writers of the New Testament.”

The attempt to prove that the New Testament contains no allusion to a future of the organised Church is a fine specimen of the manner in which a headstrong theorist may read all kinds of texts into the service of his favourite idea. But we have said enough to warn our students against this crude production.

Men of Faith; or, Sketches from the Book of Judges. By Luke H. Wiseman, M.A. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1870.

THE title of this valuable work but imperfectly describes its contents. These are best indicated in the author's words:—“The design contemplated in this book may be described as threefold. In the first place, I have endeavoured to present a general view of that important period in the history of the Hebrew people intervening between the death of Joshua and the anointing of their first king, during which, to use the language of St. Stephen, ‘the Lord gave them judges.’ Then, selecting the four most eminent persons whom the sacred narrative presents to our view during that period—Barak, Gideon, Jephthah, and Samson; men who are specially mentioned by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews as men of faith—the results of a careful study of the history of each of them are submitted to the reader. Lastly, I have wished to render the whole subservient to purposes of edification, and have therefore introduced practical remarks and reflections.” The plan thus sketched is worked out with great ability and success. We could have wished the first part enlarged; what the writer gives is so good, and in its department so complete, that the reader is loth to miss his judicious guide when confronted by other difficulties which this portion of Holy Writ presents. If we really had merely what the title offers—“Sketches from the Book of Judges”—or if Mr. Wiseman had shown less power of dealing with questions which puzzle and confound many readers of Scripture, we should not ask for more than is here given; as it is, we venture to hope that the “general view of the period” which is presented in these graphic and instructive pages will, in a future edition, be made more complete by the addition of chapters in which, *e.g.*, the social state of the people in this transition period, and the vexed question of the chronology of the Book, may be noticed. We have seldom read a book of which it was more difficult to tire. Mr. Wiseman has shown remarkable power of combining accuracy of detail with vividness of effect. Careful and minute study of the sacred text, unobtrusive but watchful labour in detecting and exhibiting the graphic touches of the original writer which our translation has not fully caught, picturesque delineation of the scenes recorded, keen appreciation of men

and character, reverent recognition of God's working in and by the heroes of the history and the people they delivered from heathen domination, are amongst the leading characteristics of this delightful book, which is as profitable as it is interesting. We greatly admire the boldness and the success with which the writer "applies" the history and unfolds its lessons.

For specimens of the manner in which Mr. Wiseman discusses points of difficulty, the reader is referred to his treatment of Jephthah's vow—to which (rightly, we think) he gives the ordinary interpretation, rejecting the non-natural sense which the humane reader would fain give the words—and of the conduct of Jael. The following passages will illustrate Mr. Wiseman's style:—

"This farmer's son, Gideon, the son of Joash, has chosen the wine-press—a hollow basin hewn out of the rock, probably in a secluded corner of the farm—as a place of secrecy, where he can thresh out his bundle of sheaves, so as '*to hide it from the Midianites.*' Raising his eyes for a moment from his work, the young man perceives a stranger, whose approach he had not noticed—a man with a staff in his hand, quietly seated under the spreading canopy of the solitary oak which grows there. In such fearful times the sight of any stranger was calculated to excite apprehension; but the man with a staff in his hand fixes his gaze steadily on Gideon, and accosts him in a manner altogether unexpected: '*Jehovah is with thee, thou mighty man of valour.*' There is something in the speech and in the mien of the stranger which excites involuntary awe. The flail is still; and Gideon's thoughts are instantly transferred from the straw and the corn-ears which lie at his feet, to the miserable condition of his forsaken country. The stranger's salutation puzzles him. '*Mighty man of valour!*' what can he mean? A '*man of valour,*' indeed, slinking behind these rocks to thresh out a handful of corn! '*Jehovah with us,*' indeed, when we are obliged to hide ourselves in caves for fear of these thieves from the desert! Still there is something in the stranger's appearance which, while it inspires profound respect, inspires confidence, too; and in the fulness of a heart all but despairing of his country, Gideon replies, '*Oh my Lord, if Jehovah be with us, why then is all this befallen us?*' . . . Here is a man who forgets himself through concern for his country. He is accosted with words referring exclusively to himself—words calculated to arouse any dormant vanity which might be in him: '*The Lord is with thee, thou mighty man of valour.*' A vain man, or a selfish man, thus accosted, would have found all his thoughts at once turned toward himself; undefined, brilliant images of future celebrity and glory would have floated before his fancy, and his first anxiety would have been to ascertain in what way he was to attain to fame. But in the heart of this faithful young Israelite there dwells no such low ambition. Gideon forgets himself, and remembers only Israel. The cause of his suffering brethren is his cause; their humiliation is his humiliation; nor can any prospect of personal promotion or honour be acceptable unless in connection with the deliverance of his country. . . It is only a great

and noble heart which could be thus dejected. It is from among spirits of such depth and tenderness—spirits capable of a sorrow which dull men, and selfish men, and covetous men, and trivial men, are utterly unable to fathom—that God has usually chosen His messengers of liberty and regeneration. Gideon, being accosted as a hero, has not an instant to spare for self-gratulation, but bursts out into eloquent grief for the vanished glory of Israel. He displays neither unbelief, nor feebleness, nor unreasoning dejection. There is a time to weep; and the heart which has known unselfish mourning is alone qualified to make other hearts rejoice.”

The general appearance of the volume is very tasteful. The only drawback is the occasional occurrence of misprints, mostly in the quotations which are found in the notes.

Principles of a System of Philosophy, in accordance with which it is sought to reconcile the more difficult Questions of Metaphysics and Religion with themselves, and with the Sciences and Common Sense. By Austin Bierbower, A.M. New York: Carlton and Lanahan.

IF the title-page does not sufficiently declare the character of this book, an extract or two will:—“There are, however, certain laws which have always existed, and so do not depend on Him (God) for their existence, and which could not but exist, and so could not have been made different, or ever be changed. It is these laws, existing as forces in nature, etc.” “We know that we are so tied up that we cannot make a triangle with less than three lines!”

“We can, perhaps, call the necessary laws parts of God!” “We have no evidence that the lower orders, any more than men, are always doing what is best, or the best they can; but when a mule is given to kicking, it may be that it is acting beneath its privileges.”

“We have seen, however, that there are limits in nature (or in necessity rather) to perfection, or to what a perfect being can be. Even if there are certain other qualities thinkable they are not possible to be gotten into a being. A being cannot exist, or be conceived to exist, so as to fill up the full measure of perfection. This, however, needs explanation. A quality might be more perfect than it can be in a being, just as a piece of leather can be greater than it can be in a shoe. Justice or power, as we conceive it, is a more perfect thing than it is, as it can exist even in God. We have seen that God must be limited in His justice, since He must have mercy in order to be a more perfect being; yet, in conceiving of perfect justice, we do not conceive of any such limitation, but think of justice as unlimited.”

“We know not how God manœuvres all His interferences, but we easily see the principle on which He must produce evil, if He produces any in the world.”

What more need be said?

St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. With Notes. By C. J. Vaughan, D.D., Master of the Temple. Third Edition. Macmillan and Co.

THIS volume may almost be regarded as a new work. When it first appeared, more than ten years ago, it was welcomed by students of St. Paul as in many respects a model exposition, striking out a new path, and carefully avoiding the vices of method and the endless encumbrances that neutralised the value of too many other commentaries. This third edition retains the excellence of the main principle of the book, with an improved application of it; but there are some notes of declension that we cannot but observe. A few words may be spent on both.

One idea of the commentary is that of making St. Paul everywhere explain his own phraseology, and that not by giving references to his use of words elsewhere, but by introducing the very words themselves, and introducing them abundantly. Thus, the Septuagint and Greek Testament Concordances are constantly made tributary, and with a success which nearly every page amply testifies. St. Paul furnishes his own concordance, and almost his own dictionary and grammar. We know of nothing comparable to Dr. Vaughan's exposition in this respect, and we earnestly hope he will be able to extend the application of this too much neglected method to others of the Epistles. The entire *Apostolicon*, edited by such hands as his, would be a valuable boon to our exegetical literature.

Another principle that regulates the work we allude to without the same entire confidence. It is that of omitting any reference to other writers, to the history of doctrine, to the various controversies that have gathered around the Apostle's words, and to the different shades of modern opinion that make their appeal to certain of his leading terms. So far as this principle prescribes the avoidance of controversy, and shuts out of the notes those interminable references to the views of other writers which make the best of our German and English commentaries so wearisome, it has our full approval. It is a great relief to read a page without a human name, at least with no name besides those of the sacred writers themselves. But we are not quite sure that some passages in the Epistle would not be better understood if allusion was made to the leading systems of truth and error that have been based upon them. For instance, certain prominent paragraphs—classical texts as it were in Christian theology—such as are found in the third, fifth, and eighth chapters, almost demand for their thorough explanation some reference to the great divergences of thought on original sin, the atonement, and the final issues of the Gospel. In our own days it is almost impossible to give an absolutely tranquil and unbiassed heed to the Apostle's words alone. The great theories that govern the thoughts of the time, the workings of the spirit of the age in the development of St. Paul's germs, will necessarily intrude, and some of

them are so imperious that they will not retire before the mere exposition of the Apostle's language, pure and simple.

The last principle to which we advert is that of briefly condensing the writer's thoughts into words not his own. The running paraphrase has become a feature in our more recent English expositions, and it sometimes serves a good purpose. Easy as it may seem, nothing is really more difficult than to catch and fix the thought of such a teacher as St. Paul; and a good suggestive paraphrase is a rare achievement. This edition does not attempt a continuous paraphrase: that would have required a more definite interpretation of certain parts of the epistle than the editor has been willing or able to be responsible for. But we find it in such sentences as the following, which we quote with the additional object of making a few strictures upon them as we go:—

Rom. i. 4: "As regards flesh, Christ was born of the seed of David; but as regards spirit, that which was in Him a spirit of holiness, even a soul perfectly pervaded and animated by the Holy Spirit who was given to Him not by measure (John iii. 34), in whom all His works were done (Acts x. 38), and by whose quickening He was at last raised again from death (compare ch. viii. 15): He was conclusively proved to be the Son of God by the one decisive sign of resurrection from the dead." Then follows:—"The humiliation of Christ consisted in this, that He laid aside the inherent powers of the Godhead (Phil. ii. 6, 7), and consented to act within the limits of a human soul perfectly possessed and actuated by the indwelling Spirit of God. That soul, indwelt by the Holy Ghost, is the *spirit of holiness* here spoken of."

This interpretation of a much contested passage is one that escapes a less difficulty only to fall into a greater. It is certainly hard to decide between the Divine nature of the Incarnate Son and the Third Person in the Trinity in the exposition; but there ought to be no third and middle course. According to this note Christ derived from man, or took of our nature, only the flesh as opposed to the soul; and, moreover, that flesh was not the sphere of the demonstration of His Sonship: both propositions opposed, of course, to the truth. There is no passage which justifies this interpretation; and the more closely it is examined the more untenable will it appear. In ch. ix. 5 St. Paul utters more fully the same antithesis of the two natures of Our Lord; and, on the principle that "the nature of the contrast must be decided by the context," Dr. Vaughan there pleads for the full ascription of Divinity to Christ. His note is a noble one:—"Elsewhere these titles belong to the Father. Here, however, the words are evidently applied to Christ. To place a full stop at *σαρκι*, and regard the following clause as a sudden ascription of praise to God for the gift of Christ, is to introduce a harsh and abrupt transition, for which there is no cause and no parallel." This declaration, which is otherwise well supported in the note, seems sufficient to determine the meaning of the passage before us. The later saying should throw its light back upon the earlier. We might expect at the beginning of this great epistle that

the Person introduced as its subject would be introduced in the perfection of His two natures; and there is really no valid objection to the spirit of holiness being assumed to be that Divine nature which in the Son as in the Father and the Holy Ghost is a *Spirit*, and a Spirit only holy and the source of all holiness. The view of this note which represents the Saviour's humiliation as involving the "laying aside of the inherent powers of the Godhead (Phil. ii. 6, 7), and consenting to act within the limits of a human soul perfectly possessed and actuated by the indwelling Spirit of God," grazes the edges of some very perilous doctrines. As the Son of God, the Saviour was never without demonstration of His glory; the Son of Man was "in heaven" while He spoke to man, and never was without His inherent powers. But as the Son of God incarnate He was fully begotten into the perfection of His manifestation and Messianic office only in the resurrection from the dead; which resurrection, however, was at once His own Divine and necessary act, and the act of His Father.

The great *Righteousness* text in Rom. iii. is most admirably discussed, though with too narrow an interpretation of the word *righteousness*, which should be made to overarch or include the righteousness of God that is demonstrated in the atonement before it becomes the righteousness which the Gospel introduces and proclaims as its new provision for us. But the little paraphrase on ch. v. 1 gives us another instance for comment:—"Faith, the realising apprehension of Christ's work for us, introduces us into a state of acceptance of which the immediate result should be peace with God and a joyful hope; hope even amidst afflictions, knowing their salutary effects; hope founded on the knowledge of God's love as shown in Christ's death for sinners." What this peace with God means we are further told:—"As the consciousness of unforgiven sins causes a feeling of estrangement from God, and even of enmity towards Him whom they have injured, so the conviction of their free forgiveness removes that enmity." This interpretation surely cannot be sustained. We turn to the tenth verse to see what, on this subject, the "enemies" there means; and we are told that "reconciliation is in the text that of *man with God*. We were *reconciled to God*, changed from *ἐχθροί* into friends, through the death of His Son, by means of that atonement for sin which was effected in the death of Christ." Let it be remembered that ver. 10 follows ver. 9, "Much more then, being now justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him." After that verse, what can "enemies reconciled" mean but objects of displeasure from whom a wrath in its beginning has been turned away by Christ's death, and the uttermost of which wrath shall be obviated by His life? "Peace with God," in ver. 1, may include the removal of our enmity; but, if it is only that, how can a justified person be said as such to have this? Does not the consciousness of unforgiven sin suggest to the troubled sinner something besides his own estrangement (since that is the term), something like deep displeasure in God Himself? and can there be any other peace than the assurance that God's holy wrath is turned aside?

We love Him because He first loved us, and we have peace with Him because He first has peace with us.

The atoning death of Christ is, with the exception here referred to, expounded and vindicated most fully. Especially is the deep meaning of ch. vi. well exhibited; and the mystical union of believers with Christ in His death and life is brought out in a more thorough manner than is usual with our older commentators. But the mention of this suggests to our minds the tendency observable in many recent books to disparage the doctrine of the sinner's justification by faith, and to set up against it the doctrine of a sinner's justification by union with Christ. Dr. Vaughan hardly feels as we do the importance of placing these two doctrines in their equal honour and due relations, or otherwise he would not write thus:—

"The work of St. Paul is not ended. The tame, lifeless, monotonous phrase into which theology has frozen his Gospel, may pass and be discarded—let all perish which has not life in it! More and more shall sermons which mean anything forbear the vain repetition of the *articulus stantis et cadentis Ecclesie*: we live not by bread alone, certainly we live not by formulas alone: let the Spirit breathe upon us, and we shall want it then—we shall want the thing which the phrase symbolised—God grant that it be forthcoming! For in the hour of death, and in the day of judgment, nothing, nothing will avail us but Christ the Propitiation for sin, Christ the Intercessor for the sinner!

"But, although this justification by faith may be to a superficial reader, or in certain agonies of the Church's history, the salient point in St. Paul's doctrine—it is not more so, in reality, than one other. Equally (at least equally) characteristic of St. Paul is that ideal of the Christian life which some call mysticism, fanaticism—which most men pass over as not meant for them—but which he evidently found omnipotent to lift a man above sin—the present living union with Christ the Crucified and the Risen. Instead of saying to the earth-bound, sensual, selfish being, *Sin must be encountered, in a sense of duty, that you may be accepted, that you may win heaven*—he says, *Christ died and you with Him—Christ lives and you in Him. Reckon yourself dead and risen. Put on Christ, let Him live in you. Commune with Him, love Him, abide in Him—and sin will fall off from you. The vessel filled with good has no room for evil—the soul which has Christ in it is emancipated, is free.*"

There is much in the tone of these words that we cannot approve of. But, passing that by, is there any opposition whatever between the doctrine of chapter iv. and chapter vi. in the Epistle to the Romans? Justification by faith is freedom from condemnation in Christ; and freedom from condemnation in Christ is justification by faith. For faith is the bond of union between the penitent and the person as well as the work of the Redeemer. If the union with Christ which is here so nobly spoken of regards the atonement of Jesus as offered for us that we may make its merit and its virtue our own by faith; justifica-

tion, pronounced by the justice of God, regards that atonement as offered literally in our room and stead. Both ideas are absolutely necessary; each is the complement of the other; and the perfect doctrine is the harmony of the two. After all that may be said by its enemies, and done by its friends, to disparage the old doctrine, and the old formula, the phrase "justification by faith" will never become monotonous or dry, and will never be superseded by any successor of St. Paul, or any new setter forth of St. Paul's doctrine. Dr. Vaughan as firmly believes this as we do; and, assured as we are of this, we regret that he uses this kind of language.

That Dr. Vaughan is as true to the Gospel, as he is eloquent in enforcing it, in the high sphere which he so worthily fills, is evident from the words which precede the doubtful quotation we have just referred to:—

"The Church calls it a holy doctrine. Has it always been made so? Does not the ultra-Calvinist, does not the Antinomian, surname his doctrine with the name of Paul? How can it be accounted for? Like the Virgin Mother, whose name has been made an idolatry, Paul himself might be disquieted in his paradise by the use made of his doctrine. It was the thirst for holiness which endeared grace to St. Paul. It was because he found in the cross of Christ a motive, and in the Spirit of Christ a power, to make him holy, that he loved each with a love so tender, so passionate. Men now talk as if it were a comfort to have a Gospel which made sin less penal—as if the height of human felicity were to be excused hell—as if the soul, filled with evil thoughts, a very cage of unclean birds, and so continuing, might find rest and salvation in the thought that Another had borne for it the requisite number of expiatory millenniums. Was this Paul's doctrine? Was this the trust which made Christ to him so reposeful? Was it for this that he exchanged the passion, true though violent, which burned in his young heart for Judaic orthodoxy? Read his Epistle to the Romans and answer. It was because he found that what law could not do, nor conscience, nor duty, God did in giving Jesus—*condemned sin*; made it not less sinful, but more sinful; set the mark of death upon it, and left it in its condemned cell waiting, like the French murderer yesterday, the moment unknown, but certain, of its dragging forth to execution—it was for this that Paul embraced, and died for, the Gospel! Because at last, after long waiting, he had found a charm and a spell potent enough to enthrall and to kill the inbred, the indwelling sin; because after crying for years, in the agony of a hope long deferred, *O wretched man! who shall deliver me?* he was able to answer his own question, and say, *I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord*; because now, amidst (we must suppose) many clinging infirmities, he did find prayer availing, and strength at hand, and Christ strong to save—this was why he was jealous for the simplicity, the purity, of the Gospel of grace; would allow no human improvements of it; would suffer no helping, no eking out, no supplementing, of the work of Christ; would know nothing, anywhere, ever, amongst his converts, *save Jesus Christ and*

Him crucified—Christ delivered for our offences, Christ raised again for our justification."

May the author be long spared to preach to the congregation of the Temple and to teach his students the Gospel of Christ. The sermon out of which this extract is taken, was preached with reference to some recent publications on St. Paul's theological standing. When we consider how important are the issues raised by those treatises, and how important it is that Dr. Vaughan's special circle of hearers should be sound in the faith, we almost wonder that some more direct reference is not in this volume made to the subject. And this wonder is touched with pain, when we read such a sentence as this, occasioned by some notices of the state of the text:—

"I have felt in the progress of my work that scarcely sufficient stress has been laid by the students of St. Paul upon a point just adverted to—his habit of writing by dictation. How sufficient a reason is here for broken constructions, for participles without verbs, for suspended nominatives, for sudden digressions, for fresh starts! How strong an argument, on the other hand, against that favourite expedient of his commentators, the supposition of a long parenthesis, which should leave at its close some two or three words to be read with a sentence five or six verses behind! We must picture to ourselves, in reading this profound Epistle to the Romans, a man full of thought, his hands perhaps occupied at the moment in stitching at the tent cloth, dictating one clause at a time to the obscure Tertius beside him, stopping only to give time for the writing, never looking it over, never perhaps hearing it read over, at last taking the stile into his hand to add the last few words of affectionate benediction,—and when we keep all this in view, we shall cease to wonder if in one place we find *καυχόμενοι* where we should expect *καυχώμεθα*, and in another stumble upon a superfluous *ᾠ* which brings ruin into the flow of a magnificent closing doxology."

The taste and the tendency of such a passage as this are alike deplorable. How far it was from the truth, as to the composition of these most elect documents of the Holy Ghost, it is not necessary here to show. All we can say is, that we greatly wonder how the same pen that writes the notes on chapter viii., the chapter on the Holy Spirit, could also write such sentences as these without one saving clause as to the Apostle's inspiration. The teacher has a theory and a solution for himself, no doubt; but have the young men whom he in this work teaches any defence?

An Introduction to the New Testament. By Frederick Bleek.
Edited by J. F. Bleek. Translated by the Rev. W. Urwick,
M.A. Two Vols. T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh.

DR. BLEEK has been gone to his rest more than twenty years; but his numerous works in defence and illustration of Holy Scripture will hold a permanent place. He was born in 1793, and received the best

part of his theological and critical education in Berlin, under the guidance of De Wette, Neander, and Schleiermacher. Such was his ardour in the study of Biblical *Introduction*, in particular, that he was encouraged by Schleiermacher to make that his province, which he accordingly did, and with great success, as these volumes testify. Bleek was one of that noble band of men who were raised up by Divine Providence to fight the battle of Christian Orthodoxy through the protracted contest of the earlier half of the present century; men to whom the cause of Evangelical truth is deeply indebted, and whose occasional deviations from the line of strict fidelity, or rather whose inability at all points to clear themselves from the taint of the errors out of which they emerged and against which they protested, ought to be viewed with exceeding leniency.

Dr. Bleek's design in the present work is to present a critical history of the New Testament Canon: to enter upon every question that concerns the later volume of revelation as a collection of writings. Preliminary sections conduct us over the literature of preceding generations. Then follows the history of the origin of the several books of the New Testament, with an exhaustive inquiry into their writers, design, and authenticity and genuineness. This leads to a history of the formation of the New Testament Canon as such, and, thirdly, we have the general history of the text, viz. the external history, the internal history of variations in manuscripts, and, lastly, the history of the printed texts and editions.

These volumes are admirably translated, and the possessors of the Foreign Theological Library will find in them a most valuable addition to the stock, already very rich, which they have on that series. But, in recommending it as we do, there are two hints of reservation that must be made. First, our judgment is based upon a selection of those salient questions which, in works of this class, may be regarded as the testing questions; thorough examination would postpone our notice for a long time. And, secondly, on some points which we regard as of great importance, Dr. Bleek's views are not such as we should wish our readers to adopt. Take, for instance, the question of St. John's writings. Now, as to the Gospel, the author defends St. John's authorship with equal reverence, learning, and skill; in fact, there is nothing to be compared with his vindication for thoroughness. This we have read with very great pleasure. But as to the Apocalypse, Dr. Bleek determines—if he can be said to determine—the other way. He evidently mastered the whole question, and has scarcely omitted a single element in the discussion and decision of it. But he is overpowered by the difficulties, and makes his retreat before the enemy. However, it is consoling that he sends back this Parthian arrow—we may so term it, for although it seems to justify his decision, it betrays his reluctance, and condemns himself:—

"Chapter i. 9 seems to coincide with an old tradition concerning the Apostle John, that he was banished by the Roman Emperor to Patmos, on account of his testimony. But, when we come closely to

examine the statements of early writers upon this point, we find that they really know nothing certain or definite concerning this banishment. Their statements are vacillating, and in some cases certainly mistaken. The earliest writers, for example, who mention it down to the fourth century, place the banishment, all of them, in the reign of Domitian, but the Revelation was certainly written before this emperor; so that, if Rev. i. 9 refers to a banishment of the writer and apostle John, this could not have been in Domitian's reign. It is much more probable that the entire tradition of the Apostle's banishment to Patmos rests upon this one passage in the Apocalypse, which as it runs might naturally give rise to the belief that the Presbyter John had been banished to that island on account of his testimony; and it was natural, when once this John was mistaken for the Apostle, that this circumstance should be traditionally told of him, though it originally referred to another witness for the truth bearing the same name. But, viewed by itself, the text does not necessarily convey the idea of a banishment to the island. It would certainly appear from the *I was* that when the visions were committed to writing, he was no longer there. But what seems to tell most against the Apostle as the writer is chap. xxi. 14. Judging from this passage, it is much more probable that the writer was not himself one of the Twelve Apostles. He evidently attaches special importance to the rank and dignity of the Twelve Apostles, and we should, therefore, have expected that in chap. i. 1 he would have expressly called himself an Apostle had he been one. On the other hand, it certainly is not likely that the writer would have called himself simply a *servant of Jesus Christ* if there were more Johns than one in the same neighbourhood to whom this title was applicable. Our view, therefore, is not without difficulty if the Evangelist was then living in Asia Minor, and in the district where the book was written. But, as we have already remarked, the Evangelist's coming into this district probably took place after the Apocalypse was written. The Presbyter would thus be the only Christian teacher in the district bearing the name of John, and the churches of proconsular Asia would not need a more explicit title to prevent their confounding him with the Apostle."

Now every sentence of this paragraph seems to us to tell forcibly in favour of St. John's being accepted, with the full tradition of the church, as the author. That he did not name himself as one of the Apostles, even while highly exalting the Apostolical prerogative, is in perfect harmony with his spirit and style in the Gospels and the Epistles, especially the two smaller ones. And that any ordinary Christian was selected while St. John was alive, and in the very district where he was appointed to finish his course—waiting too for a *coming* of the Lord that was special to himself—is a thing incredible. That one John, the Presbyter, should have seen the Son of God and Son of Man in that last and greatest manifestation which is recorded in Rev. i. 1, and not the disciple whom Jesus loved, and to whom He promised this, is to the Christian instinct an insurmountable indecorum. But,

passing from this, we further allude to another exhibition of an unhealthy influence derived from the desire to conciliate a foe that cannot and must not be conciliated. Defending the miracles of the Fourth Gospel, Dr. Bleek says:—

“I would briefly remark, first, that the conception of a miracle was in former times too strictly and absolutely defined, as if it only meant an extent which absolutely violated the laws of nature! and I perfectly agree with the view put forth by Schleiermacher, and now generally adopted, viz., that a miracle is an event only relatively supernatural, not absolutely violating the laws which God has established, but brought about by hidden co-operation (rarely exercised in this manner) of other and higher laws than those which appear in ordinary phenomena. Secondly, that the miracles of Christ are generally to be viewed as the result of the influence of the Divine Spirit. Thirdly, we must be content not to determine for ourselves beforehand, or *à priori*, how far this influence of God's Spirit may extend, and how far not; we must grant that it may operate not only on animate and human nature, but upon inanimate nature likewise. Fourthly, it is not unimportant to observe that the accounts given of miracles in the Fourth Gospel are comparatively rare, and by no means so frequent as in the Synoptics; and this should awaken in the minds of persons who so argue a pre-judgment in favour of St. John. In those accounts, moreover, wherein a comparison can be instituted, the account given by St. John is much simpler than the account given in the Synoptics; and, bearing in mind the comparatively late composition of the Gospel, this tells all the more in favour of the opinion that the writer was himself an eye-witness and participator.”

It is hard to tell how far Bleek himself would deliberately sanction this comparative view of miracles themselves, and of the measure of simplicity or art in the record of them; or how far he adopts a style that may tend to disarm the criticism of the opponent, whose scorn of the orthodox defender of the faith is generally of the most pronounced kind. But the suppression here and everywhere of the great fact that the glory of the only-begotten Son of God shone forth in the miracles, and not simply the power of the Divine Spirit, which was given without measure to His human nature, creates a feeling of uneasiness that we cannot shake off.

Deductions of this kind are not few. When we pass beyond this class of questions, into the pure history of the Canon, and the question of the integrity of our Scriptures, they still occur. Though the authorship of the Acts, and the general authenticity of the discourses in it, are maintained with learning and vigour, we are constantly sensitive of a lax tone, which the defenders of the Word of God adopt without sufficiently considering the dangerous consequences it involves. So it is with the Second Epistle of St. Peter, which is given up, and with some other controverted points.

As to the merely historical learning, its mass and its orderly arrangement, these volumes have a very great value. Up to their date they

are unsurpassed in fulness and precision. But in the year that Bleek died the Codex Sinaiticus was discovered; and many chapters of the work might receive no small supplement.

Manual of Historico-Critical Introduction to the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament. By K. F. Keil, D.D. Translated by Dr. Douglas. Vols. I. and II. T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh.

THIS work supplies a deficiency in our English Biblical literature. We have no similar Introduction; none, that is, which surveys the whole field with anything like the same comprehensiveness, and in the interests of humble faith in the Word of God as His word. It contains an immense mass of well-digested matter, and will prove a boon of no small value to the student who shall give it a careful study, or even consult it diligently on any particular book or question. The range of topics includes the language and literature of the Old Testament, the origin and genuineness of the individual books in their three classes of Pentateuch, prophetic writings, and hagiographa, the history of the canon of the Old Testament, the transmission of these records to our own time, with all the variations of ecclesiastical dogma concerning them.

Had the translator given us Dr. Keil simply—a man who has long taught us to thank God for his endowments and the integrity of his faith—these volumes would have been an unmixed gain to our Biblical treasury. But he has added a large number of notes, not simply as notes, but interwoven into the text by brackets, some of which represent opinions as free and speculative as Keil's and his own are sound. The consequence seems to us an injustice to Keil and a perplexity to the reader. The translator's notes are exceedingly good, and would, if placed at the bottom, be an addition to the value of the work. As it is the page is sometimes bewildering. Were the readers and consulters of the Foreign Theological Library always thoroughly educated and disciplined students, it might be an advantage to them to see at a glance what may be said in disparagement of any particular narrative, but very many of them are young students, who take refuge in a work like this from a host of flying objections, the fiery darts of exegesis, and seek to find repose. When they have to encounter Vaihinger, Lengerke, and others, fighting with them over the most sacred portions of the narrative, it creates a revulsion. At least this is our opinion, but we are well aware that many think otherwise, holding that a careful selection of the strongest points of sceptical objection, inserted skilfully, and skilfully answered, is a most useful aid to the inquirer. Our translator has on that theory done his work conscientiously and well, but we hold that it is better to defer the contest, and even the acquaintance of young students with some of these opinions, until they are forced upon the attention. Moreover, we cannot but think that it would be lawful and desirable, in issuing

an English translation of a great work like this, to omit some hundreds, we might say thousands, of the references to writers the great majority of whom must needs remain strangers to the English reader for ever.

Let it be remembered that in these observations we have not said anything to disparage the work or its translation. The work is a most thorough, honest, learned, and useful introduction to the Old Testament, intended and adapted to fortify the minds of young students of Scripture against the specific scepticism of these times. Against such a work we should be ashamed to utter a word, even were it here and there faulty. All we have complained of is the addition made to it. But the book is a marvel of cheapness, and the reader can easily keep his eye on the primary document, letting some of the residue go as superfluous. Not all of it, however, for there are some hostile opinions which must needs be introduced and contradicted, inasmuch as they are obvious and current, and cannot be omitted in the nature of things. Dr. Keil introduces them occasionally, but always for the sake of refuting or neutralising them. Take, for instance, the following, which we quote mainly to show the reader into what kind of hands he has fallen, when he sets to work on this book:—

“The following particulars are said to be proofs that the contents of the Pentateuch are unhistorical:—First, so many occurrences which contradict amazingly the laws of nature, and assume an immediate interference of the Divine energy, and not a mere higher (Theurgic) power of nature, such as might somehow be conceivable. Secondly, the treatment of primeval history in the Patriarchal and Mosaic periods, according to a religious-poetical-didactic plan. Thirdly, the slipping in of all sorts of blunders against historical truth, such as betray more recent narrators. Of these three arguments, however, the first involves a *petitio principii* in dogma, which is valueless for criticism until the impossibility of miracles has been established. In this attempt Rationalism has not been successful hitherto, and it never will succeed. There cannot occur a Divine revelation, such as the Pentateuch contains, without miracles, without the immediate interference of the living God in the development of that people to whose lot this revelation falls. The miracles wrought on and for Israel, which took place by the instrumentality of Moses, or under him, and which are recorded in the four last books of the Pentateuch, are as wide as the poles asunder from the myths and prodigies of heathenism. They are neither products of imaginative popular legend nor empty fancies of religious-patriotic enthusiasm, but real doings of the Almighty Creator and Ruler of nature, and of the world of men; and thus they by no means exclude the testimony of the narrator as an eye-witness. However, it is true that the contents of Genesis are only in a small measure extracted from contemporaneous written records; for the most part they rest on oral tradition, transmitted just within the circle of the patriarchs, and then amongst the chosen race. Yet this tradition might

the more easily be bequeathed by one generation to another pure and unadulterated, in proportion to the longevity of the patriarchs, their simple mode of life, and their isolation from all foreign influences. Besides, it carries the stamp of purest truth and historical value in the religious nature of its subject-matter, and in its pure moral spirit, as well as in its inartificial and sober style, and its childlike simplicity and objectivity. The other two arguments are unfounded. Of course, the theocratic plan of the Pentateuch is based upon the religious principle that the Old Testament is a revelation; and this principle is didactic, because its aim was to educate Israel to be the bearer of salvation for all nations. But it is not poetical and unhistorical; on the contrary, it is strictly historical, teaching by facts, and verifying the doctrines by its doings. Finally, passages have nowhere been proved to be blunders against historical truth; for different (*i.e.* inconsistent) representations of the same thing do not occur, nor contradictions, properly speaking; nor are the historical circumstances of the Patriarchal and Mosaic times erroneously represented."

This is quoted as illustrative of Keil's spirit and method. The following will show how he handles an adversary:—"De Wette lays especial stress on this circumstance, in opposition to the historical apprehension of miracles, that there is a gradual diminution of the miraculous element in the historical books, till it entirely ceases. 'Familiarity of man with God is reserved for primitive times; at a later time it is only angels that appear; still later, the prophets are the bearers of the miraculous; and, in the accounts of Ezra and Nehemiah, after the exile, this element is wholly wanting.' This assertion is not true; and in so far as there is truth at the foundation of it, it is not convincing. God holds intercourse still with Abraham, as a man does with his friend, after having revealed Himself earlier to him in prophetic vision, and to Hagar by an angel. Also the Angel of the Lord still appears to Gideon, to Manoah, and to David, though God had already long been revealing His will by prophets; and the books of the latest prophets, Daniel and Zechariah, contain even Divine revelations by the mediation of angels. Just as little does the miraculous decrease gradually. On the contrary, it comes forth at the beginning, in the middle, and towards the end, or at any great crisis in the theocracy, in an equally strong degree; at the time of its foundation by Moses and Joshua; at the time when it lay in ruins in the kingdom of Israel, by Elijah and Elisha; and finally during the exile, by Daniel. And there were periods in which the obscure and mythical light of primeval times had long given place to the clear light of history. The history in the Bible is distinguished essentially from that of all other nations (as animated by a peculiar Spirit, the Spirit of God) just by this very thing, that we cannot apply to it the distinction which Varro makes of three successive ages: first, *legendary*; second, *mythical*; and third, *historical*."

It would be pleasant to illustrate the character and value of this Introduction by reference to the more directly historical parts. But

we must forbear, cordially recommending these volumes as worthy—whether in regard to the original or the translation—of the admirable series to which they belong.

Der heilige Augustinus dargestellt [St. Augustin]: von Dr. C. Bindemann, Greifswald, Bamberg.

DR. BINDEMANN is well known as the learned, evangelical, and profound investigator of the lives, writings and influence of the most eminent of the early fathers. Augustine is his last study, and a very complete and instructive one it is, especially as bringing before us the main features of that system of doctrine which has moulded for good or evil the elements of the New Testament more than any other, since or before.

The first chapter takes a general view of Augustine as bishop. His episcopal residence and surroundings are exhibited in an interesting manner; the clergy of Hippo were around with him in community, practising the Christian rigour of an entirely consecrated life, without the excesses of asceticism. It was a school of the prophets, or rather of clergy and bishops, whence many a disciplined spirit was taken for service. Not always, however, did these selections issue successfully; Antonius, Bishop of Fussala, was an exception which gave Augustine much trouble, and caused him to turn his attention very diligently to the rules which must govern community life. The general picture of Augustine's public life and endless labours and charities is most impressive and stimulating. Through all appears most clearly the strong and earnest zeal for personal purity which stamps grandeur upon his character and reveals the secret of his great success.

After a chapter on the Letters, and the characteristics of the most important of them—a subject that deserves independent treatment—chapter iii. introduces the Manichees. He displaced the Manichean Sub-deacon Victorinus from his office at Malliana, and conducted a disputation with Felix of Hippo, which resulted in a short treatise that introduced the longer work against Faustus. This treatise exhibits Augustine's position in respect to the Divine authority and human elements of Holy Scripture—a position that has not been improved upon from that day to this. The treatise against the Manichees is a thorough exposure of Dualism, with the Pantheism that underlies it, and all the endless subtleties of argument that makes the development of God and the development of nature one. The negative side of his work—that which abolishes the fundamental principles of Dualism—leaves nothing to be desired; the positive side, that which treats of sin as a principle and a fact, leaves the unsearchable mystery that it found.

Chapters iv. and v. give a perfect view of the Donatist controversy. Chapters vi.-x. exhaustively discuss Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism. In his luminous summary, the author shows clearly in what sense Pelagianism absolutely denied the fact of original sin, and the redeeming manifestation of Christ, limiting the relation of Christ's death to

actual sins, maintaining not only the possibility but the actual realisation in multitudes of cases of a sinless condition of man before Christ, and independent of Him, and finally reducing Christ Himself to the level of a teacher and example of excellence, and elevating repentance to the possession of all the atoning efficacy of propitiation that the pardon of sin demanded. Chapter xi. treats of the other writings, chiefly exegetical, but including the *De Civitate*, of which a full account is given. Chapter xii. closes with the last years of Augustine, and a general estimate of his character. This extensive work, chiefly only a part of a greater whole, deserves the careful study of those students of ecclesiastical history who frequent the German sources.

Reasons of Faith; or, The Order of the Christian Argument Developed and Explained. With an Appendix. By G. S. Drew, M.A., Author of "Scripture Lands in Connexion with their History," &c. Second Edition. London: Longman, Green, Reader, and Dyer. 1869.

THE obvious and avowed purpose of this useful book is "to indicate a path of inquiry and reflection, by which any considerate man may be led forward, from facts around him, to a position of well-grounded and intelligent belief." The writer assumes a position external to the Christian faith. There confronts him "an institution or society known as the Christian Church:" of this Church the Bible is the historic record, the declaration and charter. It is a record, a history, and as such is to be dealt with; the accuracy and honesty of the historians therefore claim first attention. These are tested upon that portion of the narrative which includes the latter part of the life of Christ and the opening of the Apostolic era. Here a footing is gained, and from it the whole record is to be explored and examined. Thus testimony is secured to the authenticity of the history of the origin, purposes, and ordinances of the society which has placed that history in our hands. In the New Testament, the Bible history is seen at once to contract itself into the Life of Christ. The four Gospels are the fragments of a biography around which, as its central line, the narrative is carried onward.

The life and character of Christ form the subject of investigation. They are of such a nature as to demand a patient attention to the teachings of Christ. An examination of the Jewish position and character of Jesus Christ is rendered necessary by his identification with Jewish institutions. Christ's reverent use of the Old Testament Scriptures compels our examination of them, that we may ascertain in what relation they stand to those already investigated. Then follow in order the verification of the Old Testament and the proofs of its unity. Attention is here directed to the large mass of testimony which has been gathered under the head of "External Evidences of the Old Testament." Afterwards the Old Testament is to be examined in the light of Christ's teachings. The order and intention of these older Scrip-

tures are to be traced as Jesus "opens out" their meaning. Thus we arrive at a view of their unity and organic connection with the New Testament, and so the entire Bible is shown to form just such a complete record as the Church described when we first received the volume. This unity is further indicated by the continued presence and agency of one Being, who is its subject in every page. Christ claims to be He. To substantiate this claim by a reference to His works is the next stage of the inquiry. We are here brought to the centre of the argument. "Having learned thus much concerning Him, more information, and that of the most momentous character, must be within our reach; in short, we are now coming close to the very heart of that awful mystery with which He is surrounded." Christ claims to be Divine. That claim the Church in all ages has admitted. Hence the nature and foundation of Christ's claim are examined.

From this point our attention is turned to the consideration of difficulties; and then come up for investigation the limits and mysteries of Revelation, and the distinction between Christ's Gospel and the religions of the world. A chapter on the Christian life, and one on the future prospects of the Church, and of human society generally, properly give a most practical turn to the inquiry. Thus it is proved that the whole ministers to the establishment of righteousness; and, after all, the confirming testimony to the Gospel is wanting, until it is proved by experiment to be the power of God unto salvation.

Thus we have indicated the order of the argument which is here developed and explained; and we lay down the book with thanks to the author for the clear, attractive, and practical guise in which he has presented the leading evidences of Christianity; and, as the work itself was not designed to be exhaustive, we thank him for the ample suggestions and directions given to the reader who may desire to pursue his investigations further into this profound and hallowed subject.

Ante-Nicene Christian Library. Vols. XV. and XVI. The Writings of Q. S. F. Tertullianus. Vol. II. Translated by Dr. Holmes.

The Apocryphal Gospels, Acts, and Revelations. Translated by A. Walker, Esq.

DR. HOLMES' translation of another section of Tertullian's writings is marked by conscientious care to solve every difficulty, and leave nothing in an unsatisfactory state. It is a difficult task that has been assigned to him, but he is a good and honest translator. The volume of spurious writings has a useful purpose to serve. These documents have always tended to the glory of God and the furtherance of the truth, false and unworthy as they are in themselves. And the same reason that makes us thankful for their preservation, makes us thankful for their translation into English.

Messrs. Clark are keeping faith with the theological public, and we

hope their subscribers and the public generally will not fail to appreciate their efforts and support them in their great experiments. We notice that the announcement of the translation of the works of St. Augustine is still kept before our attention, and augur that the difficulties of the undertaking, as in prospect, have been fairly overcome.

Words in Season: a Manual of Instruction, Comfort, and Devotion, for Family Reading and Private Use. By Henry B. Browning, M.A., Rector of St. George with St. Paul, Stamford. London: F. Pitman, 20, Paternoster Row. 1870.

A DEVOUT, spiritual, reverent book; written with the pure purpose of aiding men to work out their salvation. Practical in its aim, it is simple in its treatment of the verities of the Faith, which are the verities of Life and Salvation. It is a book to have in one's closet, and to use as an aid to meditation and prayer. It is worth a cart-load of speculation. There are, however, traces of a doctrinal system from which we are compelled to dissent.

Chimes from Heaven's Belfry. By G. Hunt Jackson, Author of "The World-Wide Want." London: Richard D. Dickinson. 1870.

THIRTY-SIX short sermons, or sketches of sermons, the aim of which is good; but the execution is imperfect and feeble. They are too short and snatchy to be very instructive, and not fresh enough to be suggestive.

Consolatio; or, Comfort for the Afflicted. Edited by the Rev. C. E. Kennaway, with a Preface by Samuel, Lord Bishop of Winchester. Rivingtons: London.

THIS is a book full of most gracious passages from the writings of holy men among the moderns. The best extracts are from Leighton and Jeremy Taylor, and there is nothing in the volume to render it an unfit companion for the house of any afflicted Christian's private meditation. For the rest, it is a very handsome and portable little book.

The Whole Works of Robert Leighton, D.D. By W. West, B.A. Longmans. Vol. V. Expository Lectures.

WE have only to note that this new and beautiful edition is advancing fast towards completion. Much in these volumes has never before appeared; and all has the benefit of ample corrections, illustrative, and indexes. This must needs be the standard edition.

The Church and the Age: Essays on the Principles and Present Position of the Anglican Church. Edited by Archibald Weir, D.C.L., Vicar of Forty-hill, Enfield; and William Dalrymple MacLagan, M.A., Rector of Newington, Surrey. London: John Murray, Albemarle-street. 1870.

Ecclesia: Church Problems Considered, in a Series of Essays. Edited by Henry Robert Reynolds, D.D., President of Cheshunt College, Fellow of University College. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1870.

THESE two volumes should be read together. Both are dated the same month: "Epiphany, 1870," say the Anglicans; "January, 1870," say the Congregationalists. Both are manifestoes of leading movements, and of some of the leading minds in these movements. The former is Anglican, but not Ritualistic, and shows such names as those of Bishop Ellicott, Dr. Hook, and Dr. Irons; the latter is liberal Congregationalist, and shows such names, besides the editor's, as Stoughton, Baldwin Brown, R. W. Dale, Henry Allen, and others not less distinguished or less liberal. Both are intended to show how the principles of the respective parties are to be expressed and applied in the modifications and the outworkings needful to adapt their respective systems to the exigencies of the times which are passing over us, and the times which are to follow.

The Church and the World was the title of the volume which lately for three successive years set forth the daring theories and projects of the advanced Ritualist party in this country. *The Church and the Age* is not the manifesto of advanced Ritualists, but of pure Anglicans; most, if not all, of them of a school decidedly to be called High, but not all equally high. We are somewhat surprised to see Dr. Barry's name in connection with the other writers in the volume. Before-hand we should hardly have set Dr. Barry down as a High Anglican.

Dr. Hook most properly leads the way with a typical introduction on Anglican principles. It seems to us that the Dean is right in maintaining the historical continuity of his Church, with its unbroken organisation and its ministerial succession, as a great and distinctive feature of its character and nationality as the ancient and true mother-Church of this Christian land, and as individualising it among the Churches of Europe as a Reformed National Church, separating it alike from the Roman Catholic Church and from Protestant Churches. But whilst this feature is in some respects a source of peculiar grandeur, and influence, to the Anglican Church, we are among the number of those, on the other hand, who regard the halting and incoherent result of the reforming movements in our English Church—the arrest of reformation, which no less markedly characterises its history and position among the European Churches—as a grave evil, reaching in its effects through all generations from the time

of partial reformation until now, and farther than can be foreseen thereafter. In saying this, however, we do not mean to say that we should have preferred Calvinistic Presbyterianism to High Arminian Anglicanism. We should find it very hard to choose between two such alternatives. But we see no better reason than the unfairness and prejudice which we are bound always to condemn, why in England a result might not have been attained such as, whilst honestly and effectually reforming the Church, would have left it neither High Anglican nor Calvinistically Presbyterian. Of all this, however, it boots not now to speculate.

Dr. Hook, as would be expected, regards Calvinistic Puritanism as having no place of honest right in the Church of England. Now, if the whole matter is to be settled by a reference to the Act of Uniformity, and the history and development which have been the sequel of that Act, Dr. Hook may be right. There is, at least, a great deal to be said for his view. But we do not think it is fair in the Dean, and other writers of his school, to ignore the fact that during the really reformatory period of the Church of England—let us say for the half-century following 1540—High Anglicanism—the Anglicanism of Bishop Sheldon in the seventeenth century, or of Bishop Wilberforce and Archdeacon Denison in the present age—had neither credit nor footing in the Church of England. During the earliest and most truly reformatory period of that half-century, Calvinistic Puritanism was in the ascendant. It appears to us, therefore, to be both inconsistent, and also, in some sort, ungrateful, at once to claim for the Anglican Church the credit of being reformed, and to proscribe the faith and the doctrinal kindred of her Reformers. The spirit and the power which were remoulding the Church of England were Calvinistic and Puritan until, by the great Armada triumph, the great majority of the Catholic gentry of England were reduced to complete submission to the State and Church of Elizabeth. Their reconciliation and inclusion placed Puritanism, whose adherents had been always in a minority in the nation, in a position of inferiority, not only numerically but politically, in the Church. The Church then became again truly national, but national only as including two contrary parties: the Puritan party of movement and reform, the Anglo-Catholic party of conservatism or retrogression. But, after all, it was only in virtue of the existence of the former party that the Church of England was any otherwise reformed than in so far as it had been nationalised by the substitution of the sovereign's for the Pope's supremacy. At the same time we should find it hard to contend against Dean Hook that the Calvinistic Low Church party has now, or has had since 1662, any true standing-ground within the Church of England, as by law and formula defined. But, surely, it is not in accordance with the truth and prescription of history, or with national equity, that this should be the case. No party has a better title to claim right of rooting, and liberty of growth and development, within the Church of England than the representatives of national English Puritanism. Hence, with what-

ever apparent violence of construction at certain points, the Courts of Law have vindicated for the Evangelical party in the Church of England a right to maintain their historical and representative place within her pale. Meantime, the High Sacramentarian party also have their own difficulties in maintaining a right and title to belong to the Church of England. Prebendary Wells, in this volume, teaches expressly that the Holy Communion is, indeed, a sacrifice, an actual and veritable sacrifice; whereas the Homilies of the Church of England, which surely have high and undeniable authority, warn us "to take heed lest our communion be made a sacrifice."

Still, such is the theory, such the formularies, such the whole spirit and genius, of the Church of England, that the Low Church Puritan section is at a great disadvantage, as compared with the proper Anglican party, in maintaining its position, or providing for any development within the Church; and the volume we are reviewing is itself one of the evidences of this fact. No Church, no section in any Church, can succeed, which is merely a preaching or a doctrinal organisation. Fellowship and discipline—fellowship in heart and experience, fellowship in organisation and in activity, and discipline which makes fellowship a real privilege, and which fences and guards the way to fellowship—these are the life-necessities of a Church. High Anglicanism has its own way of providing for these things; provides for them in ways which may be offensive to our Protestantism, but which yet meet the craving of heart, conscience, active faculty, in multitudes of cases; provides for them by the confessional, by brotherhoods and sisterhoods, and now latterly by revival hymns, by rousing sermons, by processions, and, what almost seems stranger still to those who first knew the Church of England in the last generation, by prayer-meetings. So long as the Evangelical Low Church is mainly a mere combination of ordained ministers to provide orthodox Evangelical preaching and some Bible-classes, with Dorcas Societies and Mothers' Meetings, it will not be able to cope with the wonderful energy and the masterly powers of organisation, added often to remarkable preaching gifts, of which High Anglicanism has developed so vast an array. Mr. MacLagan's essay on "The Church and the People" well exemplifies some of the points to which we have referred. We extract a few passages in illustration:—

"First of all, our efforts must all be guided by this one great principle,—that our ultimate object is not to fill the church, but to win souls; to awaken, to convert, to guide, to direct, and to edify individual Christians: in short, to make them ready, one by one, for their true life in a better world. We have therefore not only to bring them to church, but to keep them there; and, more than this, to get hold of them: to make a personal impression on them; to raise them above that dead level of mere devout hearing either of prayers or sermons, which too often represents the worship of a large proportion of our congregations. The old superstition is not yet exploded which South quaintly described as a belief that we can be 'pulled up to heaven by

our ears.' Our inquiry, then, as it concerns the outlying masses of our people, really divides itself into two. How are we to get them to come? and then, What are we to do with them?

"As regards our first question. It is evident that the ordinary services of our Book of Common Prayer are arranged with a view to the worship of the faithful. They are intended for those who are willing to come, and who are so far instructed that when they do come they may be able intelligently to join in the worship of the congregation. But the Church has a missionary work to do even within her own borders, for which the Prayer-Book was never intended. When we stand surrounded by thousands who never come to church at all, and who, if they did, would as little understand the service as if it were in Latin as of old, we must be content to lay our Prayer-Books aside, and to look for some means by which we may first draw the people to the church, and then edify them when they come. This will not be accomplished by the ringing of a church-bell, nor by a notice-board detailing the hours of Divine service. The godless, reckless, and too often profligate men and women who abound in our populous parishes care for none of these things. They have heard the bell and they have seen the board for years past, but they have no notion that they have anything to do with them. We must, therefore, in some way or other, go out into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in. We must go to them, or send to them, one by one, and entreat and persuade them to come, if it were only once, to the house of God. It is easy to object to this kind of proceeding, that they will come to oblige us, and not because they wish to come; that they will come perhaps, expecting some temporal benefit, rather than desiring any spiritual good. Our answer is, that these lower motives are not to be too closely scrutinised, so long as they are likely to lead to higher good. We remember that of the multitude who came to Christ, and found a blessing for their souls, a great proportion came in the first instance simply to seek relief for their bodies; and that the motive which gave the first impulse to the returning steps of the prodigal son was the thought of the bread enough and to spare which he remembered in the house of his father. . . .

"Arrangements must then be made for a visitation of the parish—every house, and if possible every family—or every man and woman, if it might be. Where this can be done by the clergy themselves it is much to be preferred; indeed, only where this is impossible ought it to be delegated to others. But when it must be so, then the lay helpers must do the work, and by preference the more godly and experienced among them. Each will carry with him a message of invitation in simple, forcible language; earnest and affectionate, but free from exaggeration; dictated by a 'spirit of power and of love and of a sound mind.' With this printed message may be given also the word in season, if opportunity offers; a single kindly word, which will often gain acceptance for the message itself. This visitation of the parish will take some time, but it ought immediately to precede

the work of the Mission. The Mission itself may vary to a great extent in its details. It may extend over a week or over a fortnight, or some intermediate period. The nightly sermons may be preached by the same preacher, or by a succession of preachers, who ought to be selected as having peculiar gifts suited to this special work. What is wanted is simple, but powerful, awakening sermons—preached freely and not read—spoken as by man to man—yet spoken with authority as by a messenger from God charged with a message of mingled mercy, love, and warning to His people. Let there be no formal service of Evening Prayer, or even the ordinary Litany, but some few Collects or simpler portions of the Services suited to those who are unused to worship, and have rather come to hear. The hymns, which may be taken from some special collection, ought to be earnest and hearty, and in the truest sense Evangelical, and sung to well-known or simple tunes. There ought to be no attempt to discourage the attendance of the regular worshippers. It will be good for themselves to hear again the first principles of the doctrine of Christ; or perhaps to get a real hold for the first time of the truth as it is in Jesus. And they will be there to show kindness to the strangers in many little ways, and to help them by their prayers. They may also see some whom they have visited in their homes, or whom they have been trying to influence, and after the service is over they may persuade them to remain to the after-meeting, of which we now proceed to speak. This is, perhaps, the special feature of the Mission, for it is the means employed to effect the best and most important of the objects of which we have spoken above, viz., to win a personal hold upon individuals, and to deal with them singly with a view to their conversion, their restoration, or their instruction, as the case may be. Here again there is abundant room for diversity of detail. The meeting under the form of an Instruction Class or Bible Class may be held in the church itself. The people who stay may be gathered together in some part of the church most convenient for the purpose; the preacher or the parish priest, speaking to them simply from the reading desk or lectern, or walking up and down them, while all are at liberty to listen or to pray or to go, as they may feel disposed; but never, if possible, without some attempt being made to induce them to come again, or to see their clergyman privately, or to leave their names and addresses that he may visit them. It may be asked, in reference to these arrangements, ‘What becomes of the Act of Uniformity?’ We do not profess to give a complete answer to that inquiry. It is a large question and one of considerable difficulty. We believe, indeed, that it is now held by the highest authorities, though never judicially decided, that after the Daily Morning and Evening Prayer have been duly said, the clergyman is at liberty to use, even within the church, any other service, so long as it is wholly taken from the Book of Common Prayer and from the Holy Scriptures. But we fear—we had almost said we hope—that many of the clergy allow themselves a greater latitude than this; and we should be

thankful to see provision made for other services in our churches, the materials for which might be gathered from different services—not even excluding extempore prayer, so long as each separate form of service had the sanction of the Bishop of the Diocese. This of itself would allow of our churches being much more frequently used, and in many other ways than has been the custom; and it is certainly very desirable that they should be used in as many ways as possible, consistent with their great purpose as houses of prayer consecrated for the worship of God. If the Act of Uniformity stands in the way, is there anything so sacred in this particular statute that it may not be modified or, if necessary, abolished?"

Such is the activity, the energy, the Christian benevolence and zeal of High Anglicanism. At the same time, it must never be forgotten that at the very heart of its doctrinal system lies the Christ-dishonouring, Christ-suppressing, materialistic doctrine of necessary sacramental efficacy, than which we can conceive of no more lamentable or more pernicious perversion and degradation of Christian truth. This Anglican paganising of the doctrines of grace appears at many points in this volume; but it comes out most strongly and fully in Prebendary Sadler's essay on "Liturgies and Ritual."

Dr. Weir writes in a really liberal spirit on the subject of "Conciliation and Comprehension; Charity within the Church and Beyond." But however truly liberal and kindly the personal spirit and character of a High Churchman may be, his narrow and unspiritual system makes it almost as hard for him to be really large and equal and brotherly in his treatment of those whom he speaks of as belonging to "the Sects," as for a Roman Catholic to be liberal and kindly in his treatment of heretics or schismatics. Often the Anglican's liberality becomes, indeed, however well-meant, more offensive to the Nonconformist than his antagonism. Dr. Barry's essay on "The Church and Education" is throughout able, excellent, and of the right tone. Bishop Ellicott contributes an instructive essay on "The Course and Direction of Modern Religious Thought." Dr. Irons writes learnedly and ably on "The State, the Church, and the Synods of the Future." The other essays, on "The Religious Use of Taste," on "The Place of the Laity in Church Government," on "The Private Life and Ministrations of the Parish Priest," and on "Indian Missions" (by Sir Bartle Frere), are all of interest and value to the thoughtful student of the signs and needs of the present time. The style of the essays in general is that of earnest, cultivated, thoughtful, and able men, too well educated, and too profoundly practical in their purpose, to think of anything but how best to make their meaning and purpose seen and felt.

The Congregational volume, alike in its title and its prevailing style, is more ambitious and more speculative than that of the Anglicans. The men of the National Church seem to feel that their work is already in hand, and that it is coming more and more into view; that they have already the clue in their fingers which cannot but lead them on to

great results. The consciousness of power and the sense of a great vocation, with which they write, make themselves felt from page to page. Whereas the Congregationalists leave the impression that they are endeavouring, with not a little conscious difficulty, and with some confusion, to effect a change of front in the presence of wakeful and wary opponents. They have to modify their theory of congregational independency, and to modify the hitherto prevalent ideas in regard to the admission of members into fellowship with the Church. Dr. Stoughton begins the argument on the former head. He cannot but admit, even in trying to explain the fact away, that the word "Church" in the New Testament is used more than once in reference to a community of Christians inclusive of many congregations, and even extending through a province or country. He cannot but admit, moreover, that in Apostolic times a plurality of congregations, each under the immediate charge of a plurality of elders, and constituting, collectively, but one church, or organised Christian community, was the rule in large towns, *i.e.*, wherever such a community was possible. And yet because there are no traces at that period of a distinct organic union of churches which embraced many towns, or extended through a province, he has the temerity to infer that such an organic union is opposed to primitive principles, whereas it is clearly the development and consummation towards which those principles directly tended. Such an organic union could no more have been consummated within the period represented by the lifetime of St. Paul, than elders and deacons could have been ordained in every city from the first day that the Apostle preached the Gospel there. Conditions of geography and social isolation were against its being realised immediately. Churches must first be multiplied, and their individual organisation completed. When there was no church between Berea and Corinth, and none between Corinth and Rome, there could not be a provincial synod of Achaia. Nor could this be while the Church of Corinth itself remained unorganised. Time must be allowed for principles to operate and tendencies to grow. Meantime, Dr. Stoughton admits enough to show that the old theory of congregational independency is, at some points, opposed to primitive and Apostolic Christianity.

Though we thus write of our admirable friend, Dr. Stoughton, than whom there does not live a more catholic or generous Christian, and though there is much in some of the other essays, as for example, that of Mr. Rogers, to tempt criticism, yet the volume, as a whole, is a great honour to the Congregational body. Its learning, its weight of thought, its fine temper, its breadth of view, its Christian tone, its real Evangelical spirit, combine to make it a highly valuable volume. At this time it will stir much thought. We trust it may do much good. The essays of Dr. Reynolds and Mr. Dale, in particular, contain masterly arguments in defence of Evangelical orthodoxy, and in opposition at once to rationalistic and ritualistic expositors. Anglicans, the best of them, would learn much if they would condescend to listen candidly to these men, who, in not unimportant respects, are vastly the superiors of most of them as divines.

Rome and the Council in the Nineteenth Century. By Felix Bungener. Translated from the French. With Additions by the Author. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1870.

BUNGENER's quality as a critic and controversialist, is well known. The present volume shows him at his best. It is admirable for its brief, compact, trenchant logic; for its comprehensiveness of range; for its profound and searching criticism of the principles and developments of Popery. In Janus we see the process of usurpation and perversion in the Papal development, traced minutely out by a "Catholic," who clings half-despairingly to Catholicism as apart from the policy and bondage of Papal Rome. Bungener, on the other hand, points out, with unrelenting logic, that Catholicism can only be delivered from the bond and bondage of Papal fraud, superstition, and tyranny, by giving up the organic ecclesiastical unity of which Rome has been, and must continue to be, the only possible centre; that "the Jesuits are the Church;" that the Council is fated and compelled to go all lengths with the Pope; that the struggles of bishops and nationalities against the plans of the Pope and his advisers could not possibly be other than vain reclamations against the principles of the system to which they are bound, against the law of cause and effect, against the inexorable logic of tendency and necessary consequence.

The following are the closing paragraphs of this searching, eloquent, and every way remarkable volume:—

"We are not of those who imagine that the Papacy will fall to-morrow, and Catholicism the day after. We know only too well how closely the roots of the entire system still twine round the human heart; we have seen but too clearly in our day by what means this result is secured. Religion is made increasingly easy; by the development of the worship of the Virgin, religiosity takes the place of religion; everything in the Gospel that was distasteful to the human heart is eliminated. Regarded as the seat of authority, the Church of Rome is the most convenient pillow of idleness offered to everyone who wishes to obtain his faith and salvation ready-made. Regarded as a party, it is the largest and most compact of coteries, offering an inexhaustible field to the spirit of party in every rank, and under every form. Regarded as a government, it is a field open to every kind of ambition, offering simultaneously all the seductions of the most varied forms of polity. It is an absolute monarchy, for there are a court and a prince dispensing innumerable favours; it is a feudal power, for there are a crowd of petty courts, of petty princes, each also powerful to raise and enrich; it is a republic, for anyone may reach to the highest dignities. Love, fear, confidence, distrust, all contribute to the consolidation of unity. Priests, laymen, men, women, great and small, governments and peoples—Catholicism holds them all by the closest fibres of that old heart, which it is by no means anxious to renew. It holds them as believers; it holds them still even if they are

infidels; for, under such a system, though the link of faith be broken, there will remain a hundred more. Ah! no, the Papacy is not destined to fall so soon; and even if it be driven from Rome, it will still have a long future before it in which to issue Syllabuses, and to convene councils, if minded for such pastimes. Its death-throes may last for centuries.

"But, after all, why need we trouble ourselves about the precise moment or hour? God reigns, and usurpation must come sooner or later to an end. Is there no punishment in the mere prolongation of such an existence, when that prolongation can only be obtained at the expense of increased errors, eccentricities, and disgrace? 'Is not such a life death? There are sometimes corpses that walk the earth; Dante speaks of them in his dreadful lines. He tells us that he saw among the dead those who were still on earth, who were thought and who thought themselves to be alive. A fearful picture of those lives which are *life* no longer, because they have ceased to fulfil God's intention. Yet God has been very patient. Long, long did He suffer the streams of true Christian life to circulate freely amid so much error and corruption. But now God is weary of mixing His heaven from above with this lump that will not rise. He abandons you to the merciless current of your principles and traditions. Our age has seen the last of those Christians who were also good Catholics. Bewildered and forlorn in a Church which was becoming daily more and more Papal and Ultramontane, they still only desired to place at its service their zeal, their lights, their faith, and their influence; they only asked that the old ship of St. Peter should trim her sails a little less towards human passions, and a little more in the direction of the Spirit of God,—and, for answer, they have been thrown overboard.

"The time will come, believe me, when your Church will blush to have so far forgotten, at the feet of a man, her dignity as a great Church and the honour of her Invisible Master. The time will come when this page in the world's history, written amid such shouts of triumph by the enthusiastic soldiers who think they have attained, they and their chief, to universal dominion,—when this page, I say, shall be no more for the Christian and the philosopher than a subject of study both sad and strange. The present Council can add but a few lines to that page, lines sad and strange likewise. Logic has its laws, and Providence its immutable decrees; your logic is driving you onward for ever; but God has fixed the hour when its chains shall be broken, and when His logic, which is that of truth, shall resume possession of the world."

The Creator and the Creation. How Related. By John Young, LL.D. (Edinburgh), Author of "*The Christ of History.*" A New Edition, thoroughly revised and altered. Strahan and Co. 1870.

If we are not mistaken, this book of Dr. Young's, in its earlier form, was entitled "*The Mystery of Evil.*" "At first," the author explains

"the intention was disclaimed of hazarding a solution of the mystery of evil. Nothing more was presumed than to inquire what the mystery really was," &c. Now, however, Dr. Young believes himself to have discovered a solution of the mystery; and "the present edition is virtually a new work, in execution, and, above all, in spirit and aim." Dr. Young's solution is universalism.

Dr. Young is an honest, devout, and intrepid truth-seeker. But yet he looks only at one side of his subject—one side of the mystery of man's nature; one side of the moral bearing of his theory; one side of the meaning and testimony of the Scriptures. Moreover, he by no means sees down far enough into the depths of the mystery of creation, and the abeternal creative agency of the eternal Being. Has he really asked himself what sense the words *earlier* and *later* can have as related to absolute eternity? For our own part, we have long ago come to the conclusion that human reason is utterly powerless to cope with the mysteries, to human view the absolute contradictions, which rise up in any complete hypothesis as to creation and eternal Divine being and activity, which man can frame for himself. We need hardly say that the case is not relieved by resolving all into pantheism. On the contrary, the contradictions to that theory are direct in our own consciousness, are manifold, innumerable, and all-besetting. We can but come down to the facts of consciousness, of nature, and of Bible-history, and build humbly on these. Our language must still be, "Who by searching can find out God? Who can find out the Almighty to perfection?"

Journal of the Waterloo Campaign, kept throughout the Campaign of 1815. By the late General Cavalié Mercer, Commanding the 9th Brigade Royal Artillery. Two Vols. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons. 1870.

THESE volumes are published under the editorial care of the author's son; and we think we shall express the feeling of most readers of them when we say that, whatever may have been the reasons for delaying the publication of the work till the present, we are very glad that it has at last been issued in this form. The subject which gives it its main source of attraction has received much attention and discussion of recent years. And these volumes have many things about them which may be said to give them permanent value. The editor remarks, and, so far as we are aware, correctly, that the account of the Waterloo Campaign which they contain, is the first given to the world by an artillery officer.

The author was the second son of General Mercer, of the Royal Engineers, who served in America during the War of Independence, and was for twenty years commanding-engineer in the West of England. We have heard pleasant accounts of his goodness of heart from one who can remember him well. His son, the author of the *Journal*,

was born in 1783; joined the Royal Artillery when he was sixteen; was ordered to Ireland at the time of the Rebellion, and to South America to join Whitelock's River Plate Expedition in 1808; had no chance of sharing in the Peninsular Campaigns, but took part in that of Waterloo; was sent in later years to Canada (1824) and Nova Scotia (1837); afterwards held the command of the garrison at Dover; and died near Exeter two years ago at the advanced age of eighty-five.

During the campaign of 1815, General, then Captain, Mercer commanded a troop of horse artillery. (He was only second captain; but his superior, Sir Alexander Dickson, was employed elsewhere.) He was in the habit of putting down every evening some rough notes of the events of the day, and of the impressions which they had made upon his mind. From these he drew up an extended narrative about fifteen years afterwards; and it is this which, after the lapse of forty years, is here presented to us. The *Journal* begins with the author's march from Colchester to embark at Harwich on the 9th of April, when the news of Napoleon's escape from Elba had caused orders to be issued for the troops to be hurried to the Continent. It ends with his return to England with his troop in the end of January, 1816. Of the intervening time, two months (in the autumn) were spent on leave at home. During the rest the narrative keeps us well informed as to the writer's movements. And the special character of the work may be indicated by mentioning the fact, that the writer's personal experiences and immediate surroundings are the prominent topics. When he extended his notes into their present form he, as we think wisely, preserved the character of a journal. He did not introduce explanatory remarks as to the general position of affairs at particular dates, or lengthy descriptions of the successive movements of the allied forces and the French. This he might easily have done; but it would have spoiled the form of his *Journal* without giving it the completeness of a regular history of the campaign. In what, then, does the value of the work consist? In this, that we have in it an account, written in an excellent style by one who was a good amateur artist and a keen observer, of what he saw with his own eyes in the Low Countries from the middle of April to the middle of June; of his own experience of the fighting on the 16th, 17th, and 18th, and of what struck his attention in the subsequent march into France, and occupation of the capital by the allies. If his descriptions are somewhat microscopic, it is because he had an eye for minute details, and saw how they give truthfulness and colour to a general outline. The reader, who is already acquainted with the general history of these eventful weeks, will be able to take most information out of General Mercer's particular account. This remark applies especially to the chapters which refer to Quatre Bras and Waterloo. But this must not be taken to mean that the narrative is not of general interest, which it most decidedly is.

General Mercer's book shows us how little was known by persons

situated as he was of the prospects of the war before the battle of Waterloo. It also suggests many interesting points to the careful reader. Naturally, he regarded with special attention the novel scenes of rural and urban life, which had hitherto been closed to him. And for this reason he sometimes dwells at length upon objects which have since 1815 become very familiar to his countrymen. But this does not detract much from the attractiveness of his Journal.

Religious Life in Germany during the Wars of Independence.
In a Series of Historical and Biographical Sketches. By William Baur, Minister of the Ansehar Chapel, Hamburg. Translated with the Sanction of the Author. In Two Vols. Strahan and Co. 1870.

THIS is an exceedingly interesting and valuable work. It shows how civil, moral, and religious life revived in Germany, after Napoleon had reduced the Teutonic fatherland to a pitiful condition of subjection and humiliation. Here are sketches of Frederick William and Louisa of Prussia, of the Princess William, of Van Stein, Fichte, Arndt, Schleiermacher, Steffens, of Claudius and Jung Stelling, of Madame De Krüdener, Frederic Perthes, Stolberg, Palk, and Boissérée. The introductory chapters, the closing chapters, and the remarks and elucidations interspersed, unite the whole into one well-sustained history. The author is a man of Christian convictions and affections; and the whole seems to be carefully and ably written, and to be well translated. The translator signs her name Jane Sturge.

The Plays of Philip Massinger, from the Text of William Gifford. Edited by Lieutenant-Colonel F. Cunningham. London: A. T. Crocker. 1869.

The Works of Christopher Marlowe; including his Translations. (Same Editor and Publisher.) 1870.

THESE two books form the first of a series which promises to be a very useful one. If it is continued as it has been begun it will give the works of our old dramatists to the students of our old literature (a constantly increasing class) in a more accessible form than any yet produced. Clearly printed, and exceedingly cheap, it is within the reach of all. The editing is also well done; the introductory notices on the authors' lives and literary history, and the glossarial notes at the end, being very satisfactory.

One mistake, however, Colonel Cunningham has made in the case of Marlowe: he has printed the translation of Ovid's "Elegies." We are sorry for it. A critic, in one of the weekly reviews, has already lodged a serious complaint against him for this, because, to use the words of the writer, the translations "are often obscene in the highest degree." It is added, "We hope that the editor did not know what he was printing. If he did, he has committed, to say the least, a grave error of judgment, which must have the effect of banishing his volume

from decent society." The hope here expressed is absurd. Not only does Colonel Cunningham give ten pages of careful notes to this portion of the book, he even puts on his title-page, "including the Translations." He refers to them also in his Introduction. It is known that this book of Marlowe's was burned by the common hangman at the order of the bishops. Colonel Cunningham himself speaks of the translations as the mere sweepings of the author's desk, and supposes them to have been executed in his Cambridge days, and almost as a *tour de force*. When he also adds, that "the publication was no work of his (Marlowe's) own," and that "the ideas are the property of Ovid," he seems to us to have made out a strong case, not for reprinting them, but for their exclusion. They are of no literary interest; they can be well spared from the poet's collected writings; and they are, as everyone who knows the original will suppose, thoroughly and grossly immoral. We cannot forget that the books of this series are intended for popular use.

Portraits. By Augusta Webster. London and Cambridge : Macmillan and Co. 1870.

MRS. WEBSTER has given to a previous volume of poems the title of "*Dramatic Studies*," and the same title might have been applied to this one. It contains eleven dramatic monologues (the last poem, indeed, can scarcely be so called). The self-portraiture of the very diverse characters is done with great clearness. We need scarcely say to those who know Mrs. Webster's poetry that the volume is marked by great force of passion. The poem entitled "The Castaway" is, perhaps, the most complete and powerful.

Horæ Tennysonianæ : sive Eclogæ e Tennysono. Latine Redditæ. Curâ A. J. Church, A.M. Macmillan et Soc.: Lond. et Cantab. 1870.

THOSE who indulge a taste for modern Latin verse, and at the same time are admirers of Tennyson, will find special attraction in this pretty little volume. Among the eleven translators are Professor Seeley and the late Professor Conington. The fairest way to notice a book of this kind is by quotation, but for this we have not space. We can only say that among many versions of well-known passages, perhaps the finest is Professor Conington's rendering (from the *Princess*) of the lyric beginning, "O Swallow, Swallow, flying, flying south."

The Laws of Discursive Thought: being a Text-Book of Formal Logic. By James McCosh, LL.D., President of New Jersey College, Princeton; formerly Professor of Logic and Metaphysics, Queen's College, Belfast. London: Macmillan and Co. 1870.

It is scarcely necessary to say that this new book by Dr. McCosh is well worth the attention of students. Its main distinctive features may best be noticed in the words of the author, who calls attention in the

preface to the special aims and value of the book. "Had I been satisfied," he remarks, "with the peculiarities of the New Analytic, with its fundamental Kantian principles, or its special doctrines, such as that of the universal quantification of the predicates of propositions, with its extensive consequences, I would never have published this treatise. On the supposition of the Hamiltonian analysis being correct, I cannot conceive of there being better works written than those of Thomson and Bowen. The defects and errors of the new Logic are derived mainly from its German paternity. It is infected throughout with the metaphysics of Kant—just as the *Art of Thinking* is with the metaphysics of Descartes, and Mill's Logic with the empiricism of Comte. It ever presupposes, or implies, that there are forms in the mind which it imposes on objects as it contemplates them; and it makes the science altogether *à priori*, and to be constructed apart from, and altogether independent of, experience. . . . This fundamental error (so I reckon it) runs through the whole system, and injures and corrupts the valuable truth to be found in the Logic of Hamilton. I acknowledge that there are principles or laws in the mind, original and native; but these do not superinduce or impose forms on objects as we look at them; they simply enable us to perceive what is in the objects. True, there are *à priori* laws in the mind operating prior to experience; but we can discover their nature, and give an accurate expression of them, only by means of careful observation. The science of Logic is to be constructed only by a careful inductive investigation of the operations of the human mind as it is employed in thinking."

Further—"The main feature of this Logical Treatise is to be found in the more thorough investigation of the nature of the Notion, in regard to which the views of the school of Locke and Whately are very defective, and the views of the school of Kant and Hamilton altogether erroneous. . . . I believe that errors spring far more frequently from obscure, inadequate, indistinct, and confused Notions, and from not placing the Notions in their proper relation in Judgment, than from Ratiocination. Even in reasoning, most mistakes proceed from confusion lurking in the Apprehensions of the mind. We are in more need, at present, of a new analysis of the Notion and the Judgment, than of the Reasoning process. I have found that in the more thorough evolution of the nature of the Notion, especially in the thorough-going separation of the Abstract Notion from the Singular and Universal, we have the means of settling the curious questions which have been started in regard to Judgment and Reasoning in the New Analytic. In this treatise, the Notion (with the Term and the relation of Thought to Language) will be found to occupy a larger relative place than in any logical work written since the time of the famous *Art of Thinking*."

The Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics. Translated from the German of Dr. E. Zeller, by Oswald J. Reichel, B.C.L. and M.A. London: Longmans & Co. 1870.

We have already noticed at some length Mr. Reichel's translation of the part of Zeller's work dealing with *Socrates and the Socratic Schools*

(*London Quarterly Review* for January, 1869). We may therefore confine ourselves at present to remarking that this volume is quite as readable as the previous one. A translation of the part on *Aristotle and the Elder Peripatetics* was announced almost two years ago as "nearly ready." When will this promise be fulfilled?

Flowers from Fatherland Transplanted into English Soil.
By John Pitcairn Trotter, A. Mercer Adam, M.D., and
George Coltman, B.A. Edinburgh and London: William
Blackwood and Sons. 1870.

THIS is a book which lovers of true poetry will enjoy. Tried by the test of repeated readings, it does not fail. The authors from whom the poems contained in it have been taken for translation are Bürger, Schiller, Körner, Uhland, and Heine. The version of Bürger's "Leonora" is very good, as is also that of "The Wild Huntsman," of which Sir Walter Scott made a translation, or rather an imitation, in 1796, two years after the author's death. Among the pieces from Schiller is the long and exquisitely beautiful one entitled "The Walk." The famous "Sword-Song" of Körner is rendered with great spirit. But no reader will regret that by far the largest amount of space has been given to Uhland, some of whose poems are exceedingly beautiful. Take, for example of its kind, that entitled—

IN MEMORIAM.

I.

"O mother! thou didst watch me drinking
The eye's first light of earthly day;
On thy pale face, as calm it lay,
I saw a ray from heaven sinking.

II.

"A grave, O mother! has been dug for thee;
It is a silent, yet familiar, dwelling;
There home-like shadows hover peacefully,
And flowers are there, of thy sweet memory telling.

"There art thou, as in death, unchanged—my pride!
Each trace of joy and sorrow ever living;
For still to live to thee is not denied;
In my heart's core, this grave to thee I'm giving!

III.

"In echoes faint thy funeral-hymn
Has long since died away;
But, in my heart, a dirge for thee
Sounds softly every day.

IV.

"The earth was scarcely o'er thee spread,
When came a friend to weep,
Who roses brought to deck thy bed—
Thy lone, still house of sleep.

"Two at thy head—so softly glowing;
Two dark ones at thy feet;
White ones he planted, ever blowing,
Where thy true heart once beat.

V.

"Here at my feet there falls a leaf
Tired of the rain and sunshine brief;
When first this leaf was green and new
I still had parents, dear and true!

"How quickly fades a leaf away!
The child of spring—the autumn's prey!
Yet has this leaf, which flutters here,
Outlived so much I held most dear!"

Among the "*Varia Variorum*," at the end of the volume, there is a very admirable adaptation of the poem of Propertius, in which "*Defuncta Cornelia Paulum alloquitur*." It should be noticed that the translators have sought to preserve, in every case, the metre as well as the distinctive style of the original; the only exception being the poem of Schiller's already mentioned, in which the hexameters of the original have been discarded for a less artificial form. They have also tried to make the versions as literal as possible, the English often corresponding to the German line by line. Their combined labours have produced a volume of translations that may be heartily recommended for their rare excellence.

Historical Maps of England during the First Thirteen Centuries, with Explanatory Essays and Indices. By Charles H. Pearson, M.A. (Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford).

This is a very full, exact, and conscientious work, and forms a worthy companion to the author's "*History of England*" during the same period. The value of the early maps is enhanced by the representation, in colours, of the woods and fens which, at one time, covered so large a portion of the country, and of the chief variations in the coast line. Many historical facts are elucidated by these natural features, as well as by those of greater importance, the hills and rivers. For instance, "The great woods of Kent, Sussex, Hampshire, and Dorsetshire, flanked by the Romney Marshes on the east, will explain why England was settled from east and west." "Kent and Sussex were dominions formed and carefully secluded by nature. They were separate kingdoms in British times; and when the Romans left the country, they passed naturally again under the rule of different Saxon dynasties." Numerous facts of this nature might be adduced from all parts of the work in illustration of Mr. Pearson's assertion, that "Our geography is, in fact, the history of the land."

The map of Roman Britain is rather "bare of names as compared with most existing maps." This results from the author's extreme cautiousness not to insert towns and military stations, the position of

which is doubtful, and thus convey what he believes to be "false impressions." This principle is, however, sometimes carried to excess, as when he considers it "hopeless to attempt" to give the localities of the British tribes. He "doubts if the position of any (except, perhaps, the Cantii) can be fixed with any degree of certainty," and brings the apparently conflicting statements of Cæsar, Ptolemy, &c., to support his views. This rather serious omission, and others of a similar character in the work, are, to some extent, compensated for by the valuable indices attached to the respective maps. The writer's scrupulousness is also seen in his spelling of Latinised British names. He has "tried always to give the name precisely as it occurs in the best text without reducing it to an imaginary nominative," and argues from inconsistencies in the Itinerary (in which ablatives and nominatives seem to be often used indifferently) in the following fashion:—"If we, for instance, assume Lavatris to be an ablative, we must regard Eboracum and Cataractoni as ablatives also." But such double forms as Lindo and Lindum, Rutupie and Rutupis, appear sufficient to settle this question without the far-fetched supposition that the termination is "in some cases stands for the Celtic *ynys*, an island," and that the "o" is "the Roman equivalent for our *wyes* and *ways*."

We are glad to see that Mr. Pearson does not quote from the work attributed to Richard of Cirencester. It is remarkable that any scholar could ever have received so manifest a forgery.

The map entitled "*Britannia Cambrica*" is of great importance. It represents the country from the Cymric point of view, and serves to illustrate the ancient bardic poems, and the narratives of Gildas, Nennius, and Geoffrey of Monmouth, as well as the early Anglo-Saxon history, and the times of native Welsh independence. There will ever be differences of opinion as to the genuineness of the whole or parts of the rhapsodical compositions attributed to Llywarch Hen, Aneurin and Taliessin, bards who are supposed to have flourished in the sixth and seventh centuries; doubts may fairly exist whether (with Mr. Pearson) we should receive as "historical" the list of places found in Nennius, a veracious Celtic historian of the ninth century, who informs us that "St. Patrick fasted for forty days and nights on the summit of Mount Cruachan Aichle," like his prototype Moses, whom he resembled in other similar particulars; and it matters little whether Geoffrey of Monmouth was a "romancer" or a "compiler;" still, these are our chief native authorities for Cymric history from the fifth to the twelfth century; and the facts that can be extracted from them as to the remnant of the ancient Britons and their descendants, during and after their struggle with the Saxon invaders, will ever be of great interest to both races. The topography of these matters is admirably illustrated by the map referred to, which is far in advance of anything of the kind that has been hitherto attempted. In the accompanying essay are discussed the localities of Arthur's battles, and the chronological limits of the Welsh occupation of the eastern districts of England.

The maps of Saxon and Norman England are compiled with as much care and correctness as those which precede them. In the former, besides the usual matters, those minor tribes are marked which, though probably, at first, distinct states, were afterwards absorbed in the Kingdoms of the Heptarchy before the dawn of authentic Saxon history; such as the Hwicce, the Maegesetan, the Lindisware, and others. The essay attached to the map treats of the connection of the Roman and the Saxon towns, and the origin of shires. The list of Anglo-Saxon words is more correct than is usually found in English books, though even here we have the impossible plural *Coton*; *Seta* (more correctly, *Sata*), which is found in many tribal names, is explained as a *settlement* instead of a *settler*; and *mere*, a lake, a word existing in similar forms in all the Germanic languages, is, with Mr. Earle, represented as a British word; the fact, of course, being that the Saxon *mere*, Celtic *mor*, and Latin *mare*, are varieties of a common Indo-European root. "Any attempt at a rigorous orthography of proper names," Mr. Pearson thinks, is "strongly to be deprecated," and he adopts the forms as found in Beda, which are generally northern dialectical variations from the true forms; or even, in some cases, as given in Domesday Book. This, followed out, would reduce Anglo-Saxon orthography to the chaos which prevailed before Rask and Grimm took the matter up on scientific principles.

The map of Norman England, and the disquisition connected with it, is an invaluable companion to the history of the feudal times; a knowledge of the relative position of the castles belonging to the king and the nobles being necessary in anything beyond a merely superficial study of the period. Besides a full account of the fortresses at various periods, there is a second essay on English woods and forests.

The last map is ecclesiastical. Besides the boundaries of the dioceses, it marks the position of the monasteries, the distribution of which "will serve as a pretty good index how population and wealth lay in the 11th, 12th, and 13th centuries." The larger and smaller monasteries, dissolved in 1535 and 1539 respectively, are distinguished by a difference of type. The author, in connection with this map, discusses the origin of bishoprics, parishes, rural deaneries, and archdeaconries in England. He shows satisfactorily, as to the second of these, that the *mark* (*marc*) of the original Anglo-Saxon tribe, with its heathen temple, afterwards became the tithing, and the latter, or several united, formed the parish; thus combining the theories of Kemble and Mr. Toulmin Smith, at the same time allowing, in some cases, with Blackstone, that parishes may have originated from old manors.

The author speaks of his "thankless and laborious task." Laborious, indeed, it must have been, but we cannot agree to the term "thankless." All students of history will be grateful to Mr. Pearson for this atlas, the valuable character of which is very imperfectly in-

dicated in the preceding remarks. We know of no similar work in which the qualities of fulness and accuracy are so combined, and in which there is so much to learn, and so little to unlearn, as in this. The essays are both learned and interesting. The first, for instance, "On some Physical Aspects of Early English Geography," is very agreeable reading; and the whole book is full of original and highly instructive matter. We would just say, in conclusion, that the value of the indices would be considerably increased if, besides the mere name of the original authority, which is attached to every term, references to some standard edition were also given.

The Successful Student Early Crowned. Memorials of Richard Watson Portrey, B.A. By his Father. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co.

"A MAN that is young in years may be old in hours, if he have lost no time; but that happeneth rarely." This pithy aphorism of Bacon is introduced as gracefully as aptly by Mr. Portrey, the father of the youth memorialised, and the writer of these touching memorials. They contain a sketch of a very beautiful character, or rather of the very beautiful outlines of a character not permitted to unfold itself before the eyes of men in its maturity. We took up the volume with something of a feeling of sorrow that the writer was persuaded to undertake the task. But we lay it down with thanks to him for accomplishing it. No young man, in these days of hard study and competition, can read it thoughtfully without profit.

The Upright Man: a Memorial Volume of the Rev. Corbett Cooke, Wesleyan Minister. London: Conference Office.

WE are accidentally somewhat late in noticing this memoir of a very worthy man and minister of Christ. It is genially written, and with a certain effusion of feeling that is creditable to the heart of an admiring biographer, and, to those who knew Mr. Cooke, amply justified. The volume is pleasant and readable; but the best memorial of this "upright man" is the memory he has left wherever he ministered of an equable and devout and useful life and pastorate.

History of the Karaite Jews. By William Harris Rule, D.D. London: Longmans. 1870.

WE hope shortly to furnish the readers of the *London Quarterly Review* with a more extended notice of this interesting volume. At the present moment, when the Talmud is exciting a new and almost absurd enthusiasm in the theological and literary world, the appearance of the first work in English ever devoted exclusively to the history and doctrines of Karaism, the antithesis of Talmudism, is peculiarly opportune and welcome. Dr. Rule has not lost sight of the labours of his predecessors on this little-trodden field of scholarly research; but he has gone to original authorities for the bulk of his

facts and statements, and in many cases he has found access to sources of information which are in the highest degree rare or even unique. His work is one of sterling merit; it is written in a vigorous style; and we commend it to the attention of all students, whether of Scripture, philosophy, or man.

Glaphyra, and Other Poems. By Francis Reynolds, Author of "Alice Rushton, and Other Poems." London: Longmans. 1870.

The Book of Orm; a Prelude to the Epic. By Robert Buchanan. Strahan & Co. 1870.

A Tale of Eternity, and Other Poems. By Gerald Massey. Strahan & Co. 1870.

London Lyrics. By Frederic Locker. Strahan & Co. 1870.

THAT the present age, viewed on one side, is materialistic and utilitarian, cannot be doubted. Nevertheless, there has seldom been an age in any country in which the springs of poetry were fuller or more frequent; or the forms of poetry more fresh, and various, and original. Here are Robert Buchanan and Gerald Massey, both of them exuberant as well as genuine, and often very beautiful, poets, sending forth each a new volume. Here is Mr. Reynolds, a name as yet but little known, but which will undoubtedly take a place among the poets of rarer culture and of higher mark. Here is Mr. Locker, in a style, it is true, redolent of city-life, and far removed from the sphere of either of the other poets, but in a vein, notwithstanding, of genuine minstrelsy, putting forth *vers de société* which may almost rank with those of Præd.

Modern poetry is too often either sensuous (not to say sensual), and merely objective, whether lyrical, or narrative, or idyllic; or, if subjective, it is sorrowful and sceptical. Mr. Reynolds's poetry has not a little of the latter character; Buchanan's *Book of Orm* has very much. Mr. Reynolds, however, has more philosophy; has a mind more regularly disciplined; and has more thorough culture, especially more of the ancient classic culture, than Buchanan. We cannot pretend, in this brief notice, to give any account of the leading poem, "Glaphyra;" of the longer piece, entitled "Cephalus and Procris," which follows; of the pathetic but mystical and distempered lines entitled "Absolution;" or of the many minor pieces of the volume. We quote one sonnet, as a sample of the poet's mastery of measure and language—

"I love thee, Autumn; whether, rude and loud,
The moist battalions of the bordering main
Storm through the uplands, leaving in their train
The chastisement of all that hath not bowed;
Whether the morning, decked in amber shroud,
Looks through the drift of gently falling rain—
Or moonlight spreads above the steamy plain
Blue straits of sky, and continents of cloud.

I love thee, Autumn ;—all thy charms are those
Which with no rich exceeding vex the mind,
Nor for vain visions barter its repose ;
But in their soft departure leave behind
That true content which bears with present shows,
Yet to their future meaning is not blind."

Buchanan's *Book of Orm* has been written, as appears from a note of the author's, whilst ill-health has weighed upon him. This has prevented the volume from being published in a complete form. "A Rune Found in the Starlight," "The Songs of Heaven," are written, but cannot, in Mr. Buchanan's present state of health, "be made perfect for press." "The all-important 'Devil's Dirge,'" also, we are informed, is wanting in the present edition.

The body of the volume is divided into ten sections, each section being made up by a number of poems, mostly very short. "Orm the Celt" and his "Visions" appear, in a shadowy, uncertain, phantasmatic way throughout the book, the outline or method of which it would be very difficult to describe. Much of the writing is exceedingly beautiful, though full of sorrow, doubt, and unrest ; but more of it is misty and mystical. The old and insoluble problems of the world are perpetually recurring, Mr. Buchanan's gospel being universalistic. Altogether the tone of the book is so troubled and morbid, that we can well understand that ill-health has given an infection of misery to it throughout. Its obscurity also is almost as pervasive as its sadness.

Our readers do not need any specimens to be given them of the poet's power of word-painting, or of the exquisite melodiousness which frequently distinguishes his verse. It is more to the purpose to remark that he has in this book allowed himself in not a few instances to follow Mr. Arnold's bad example in publishing so-called poems, which are altogether *lege soluta*, which have neither rhyme, nor metre, nor rhythm. Furthermore, Mr. Buchanan has, unfortunately, no classical culture. Even this, however, is hardly sufficient to account for such a solecism in all ways as that which occurs in the first lines of those we are about to quote :

"Now an evangel
Whom God loved deep,
Said, 'See ! the mortals,
How they weep !
They grope in darkness,' " &c., &c.

The wild "Tale of Eternity" will not add to the fame of Gerald Massey, whose dreams as to eternity and the eternal world, by the way, are very different indeed in their character from those of Buchanan. But the "Carmina Nuptialia," and the other parts of the volume, are full of the characteristic beauties of Mr. Massey, whose gift (and he has a rare and precious gift) is that of a lyrist. We think we have seen the poem on the late Mr. Thackeray somewhere before, but we are sorry that our limits forbid us to print here lines so true, so touching, so altogether admirable.

Of the poems of Locker we have already said a word, perhaps enough : they are bright, graceful, and eminently Londonish.

Ginx's Baby: his Birth, and other Misfortunes. Strahan & Co. 1870.

THIS is a very curious little book. Ginx being a Tothill Fields' navvy, a Westminster pagan of the nineteenth century, his thirteenth baby is made the hero of a history intended to exhibit the sore places of our existing social system, to set forth the failures and wrongs of our laws and administration in respect of labour, house-provision, pauperism, emigration, and the rest of such matters. The writer is not at all nice in his notions of what may and what may not be talked about in prettily bound books intended for popular reading; he probably holds squeamishness in disdain, and reticence in horror, with regard to subjects of social urgency. Still we are not sure that he does not hold out his nudities too coarsely abroad. Delicacy may not be always compatible with fidelity; but a tender respect for it is not only a grace, but, as we think, is allied to virtue. Nevertheless, if *Ginx's Baby* is a book which seems sometimes to offend against delicacy, there can be no doubt of the earnest benevolence and honest Christian conviction and intent of the writer. The book is very clever; its style is direct and telling, at times Carlylean, after Carlyle's best and less violent manner; its humour is grim, grotesque, here and there almost savage, but very effective; its satire is caustic and amusing. The writer is evidently a lawyer, probably a barrister, and has taken a brief for the neglected and needy classes of society which he is determined to argue with unflinching earnestness and fidelity. Poor Law Boards, and mere political economists, are shown up. A political club, and certain political characters, are brought on the stage. It is easy to recognise Mr. Bright, Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Lowe, and Sir Charles Trevelyan. The author is one of those who believe in organised emigration as a grand element in the needful remedial administration by which present distresses are to be removed. We doubt if he sees the case precisely as it stands, or has fathomed the depth and mastered the bearings of his problem, either as respects town or country. We doubt not, however, that the writer of this book will be heard of again. Such power and earnestness as his are too valuable and necessary in the present age to be left in obscurity.

Christianum Organum; or, The Inductive Method in Scripture and Science. By Josiah Miller, M.A., Author of "Singers and Songs of the Church," &c. With an Introduction by John Hall Gladstone, Esq., Ph. D., F.R.S. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1870.

IN this book are brief treatises on the nature of the inductive method; its history, "illustrated by the experience of eminent inductive inquirers;" its influence on modern science; the bearing of moral character on inductive inquiries; the Christian origin of the

method, principles, and spirit of true science; the injury Christianity has suffered from the neglect of the inductive method, and the beneficial results which would follow from its adoption in theological enquiries. The central theme is the application of the inductive method to the study of the Sacred Scriptures. This, we are sorry to say, is the weakest part of a book otherwise well written.

The following is the author's example: "Suppose we are reading in the Old Testament of the suffering but noble course of Moses, or the epitome of it in the New Testament. We may confine our attention to this instance; or we may inquire how far its suggestions square with our theories or preconceived notions; or we may, as we recommend, let our minds rise to the reception of a great salvatory principle, applicable to the character and daily life of every man—that of denying self to follow Christ. Or, reading in the New Testament (Luke vii. 50), 'And Jesus said to the woman, Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace,' we may—even as the unprejudiced philosopher has, from some single fact in nature, risen to the reception of some great law that is universal in its application—so rise inductively with certainty to the recognition of the inexpressible value in the Christian system of personal faith."—P. 137.

This work is confessedly a tentative one. It is written in the interests of an untrammelled investigation of Holy Scripture, a free discussion of the articles of the Christian faith; an expansion of the Creeds, and of the responsibility to ascertain, each man for himself, the articles of his belief. The following words reveal its tendency:—"The inductive method is entirely opposed to that finality which, having arisen in a commendable desire for certainty, has ended in an idolatrous worship of systems and men. It is based on the conviction that the truth of God has a real existence, quite independent of us, or of the point we have reached in the history of discovery. And this conviction, when carried on to its just consequences, is absolutely contradictory to the idea of finality. It involves that those who have proceeded farthest in the paths of the wisdom of the Infinite have only set out on their unending journey. And it gives room for what the history of the Divine dispensations also witnesses for—progressive theology."—P. 178.

We can speak only approvingly of the tone and temper of this book, and of many good and useful suggestions it contains; but as a treatise on the application of the inductive method to Holy Scripture, we must judge it to be very imperfect.

BRIEF NOTES ON BOOKS.

Blackwood and Sons continue the publication of their attractive series of *Ancient Classics for English Readers*. The *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, and *Herodotus* are here followed by *Cæsar's Commentaries*, which an eminent novelist has taken in hand. Mr. Anthony Trollope has evidently done his work *con amore*, and we doubt not that Trollope's *Cæsar* will be almost as much a favourite

with young students of the classics as his novels are with persons who desire such recreative reading as is free from immorality and sensationalism.

Passmore and Alabaster publish the first volume of Spurgeon's Commentary on the Psalms, under the title of *The Treasury of David*. It contains the first twenty-six Psalms. The critical scholar will not come to this volume for real exegesis. But for the interesting and profitable application to heart-needs and daily life of the Psalms understood in their popular sense, every Christian may well be recommended to this characteristic work of Mr. Spurgeon's, who, however, is, we fear, greatly overtaxing his strength and time in many ways. So valuable a man should try fairly to husband his resources and economise his strength and life.

From the Wesleyan Conference Office we have received the seventh volume of *The Wesley Poetry*, the whole of this volume being, we believe, from the pen of Charles Wesley. As volume follows volume there is no falling off in quality or in interest. The present volume, indeed, is inferior in value to none of those which have preceded it. Here are the numerous beautiful and touching "Hymns for the Use of Families," which the late Henry Moore, no mean judge, and familiar with all that the poet had published, preferred to everything else from his pen. Here, too, is the "Elegy on Mr. Whitefield," one of the most glowing of Charles Wesley's productions. And here are the noble "Hymns on the Trinity," and those on "Preparation for Death."

From the same Office we welcome the republication of Mrs. Parker's *Annals of the Christian Church*, and of *William Carvoso's Life*, in two forms, one being a little more costly than the other. These republications keep up the high reputation of the Wesleyan Book-Room for the combination in its issues of cheapness and elegance. We believe few publishing houses equal that of the Wesleyan Conference in this respect. Mrs. Parker's *Annals* are suitable for use in Christian families. Of the special excellence of *Carvoso's Life* we have no need to speak.

From Rivingtons we have the continuation of Isaac Williams' *Devotional Commentary on the Gospel Narrative*, of the valuable and meritorious qualities, and at the same time serious defects, of which High Church publication we have several times spoken. The three volumes before us bear for their titles respectively *The Resurrection*, *On the Study of the Gospels*, and the *Harmony of the Gospels*. The last two, however, stand first and second in the collected series.

Mr. Stock publishes *The Pictorial Explanatory New Testament*, illustrated by Eighty-two Engravings. This is a very cheap and elegant little volume, beautifully printed, and can hardly fail to be popular.

From Strahan & Co. during the last few months there has been a wonderful flow of published volumes, of which we have noticed more than a few in the pages just preceding, as well as in the last two Numbers of this Journal. We find, however, that we have omitted to mention three, of which the announcement will be sufficient. Two of these are from the fertile and engaging pen of Dr. Norman McLeod, and are entitled respectively *The Starling and Eastward Ho!* The third is Bishop Wilberforce's volume on *Heroes of Hebrew History*. All three are republications from *Good Words* and need no recommendation from us. Many who have read them in that magazine will be very glad to be able to place them on their shelves or on their tables in this convenient and handsome form.

END OF VOL. XXXIV.

INDEX

TO

VOLUME XXXIV.

- 'Albert Dürer,' 328; his own account of his parentage, 329; the generation to which he belonged, 331; a Gothic artist, 333; the woodcuts of the Apocalypse, 335; did Dürer regard death as "King over all the earth"? 337; the mystery of his works, 339; paintings and drawings, 341; the respective Lives by Mrs. Heaton and Mr. Scott, 343; his wife, 345; Netherlands hospitality, 347; he mourns for Luther, 349; portrait of Erasmus, 351; national art, 353.
- 'Analyst, the Pulpit,' 263.
- 'Ancient Irish Literature,' 94; pre-Christian Ireland, 95; the formation of the code, 97; Patrick's tolerance, 99; origin of Druidism, 101; culture of the Early Irish, 103; their innate love of letters, 105; O'Curry, "the last of Irish scholars," 107; legendary origin of the "law of distress," 109; "agrarian outrage," the carrying out of the Brehon, 111; social condition of those for whom this code was made, 113; mode of "levying distress" on a chief, 115; a "chair of Celtic" at Oxford, 117; the *Chronicum Scotorum*, 119; the struggle against the Danes, 121; personal influence of St. Patrick, 123; the land law of the Brehon Code, 125.
- 'Ancient Classics for English Readers,' Collins's, 263.
- 'Ante-Nicene Christian Library,' Vols. XV. and XVI., 503.
- 'Apostles, Acts of,' Glog's 'Critical and Exegetical Commentary on,' 231.
- Apostles and Prophets in the Catholic Apostolic Church, the restoration of, 67; the human nature of Christ, 69; prostration of reason before implicit faith, 71; prophesyings, 73; unknown tongues, 75; Irving ejected from the Church of Scotland, 77; unclean spirits, exorcisms, doubts, 79; the hierarchy, 81; missions and liturgy, 83; prophets and apostles, false, 85; forlorn hope, 87; contempt of Holy Scripture, 89; "the Sealing of the Lord," 91; "Apostolic Catholicism" self-condemned, 93.
- 'Apologetic Lectures, the Bremen,' 439; the Mosaic creation, 441; miracle, 443; the person of Christ, 445; the Atonement, 447; Tischendorf, 449; the future, 451; Christianity and culture, 453.
- Argyll's 'Primæval Man,' 237.
- 'Arthuriad,' the Laureate and his, 154; religion in poetry, 155; Dean Alford's exegesis, 157; the two Arthurs, 159; oscillation of points of time, 161; the idea said to unite the "Idylls," 163; the Coming of Arthur, 165; the 'Holy Grail,' 169; extravagance of Lancelot's tale, 169; 'Pelleas and Etarre,' 171; a snatch of noble realism, 173; additions to 'Morte d'Arthur,' 175; the Laureate's lapse in 1855, 177; the ornate pantheism of the times, 179; the "Old Northern Farmers," old and new, 181; what the Laureate has done for the language, 183; conclusion, 185.
- 'Baby, Ginx's,' 526.
- Baddeley's 'Cassandra, and other Poems,' 262.
- Barker's 'Teachings of Experience,' 258.
- Barnes's 'Scenes and Incidents in the Life of the Apostle Paul,' 260.
- Baur's 'Religious Life in Germany during the Wars of Independence,' 516.
- Belief, 232.
- Bierbower's 'Principles of a System of Philosophy,' 488.
- Bill, Irish Land, to amend the law relating to the occupation and the ownership of land in Ireland, 414; property in land, 415; the literature of the land question, 417; Greece, 419; pays de waes, 421; the land revolution in Prussia, 423; Russian serfage, 425;

- emancipation in Russia, 427; effects of emancipation, 429; emancipation in Austria, 431; land tenure in the United States, 433; emphyteusis, 435; the Irish Land Bill, 437.
- Bindermann's 'Der heilige Augustinus dargestellt,' 501.
- Binnie's 'Psalms,' 479.
- Bird's 'Republic of Hayti, and its Struggles,' 262.
- Bleek's 'Introduction to the New Testament,' 494.
- Blunt's 'Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology,' 225.
- Brief Notes, 262.
- Brief Notices, 527.
- Browning's 'Words in Season,' 504.
- Buchanan's 'Book of Orm,' 524.
- Bungener's 'Rome and the Council in the 19th Century,' 512.
- Catholic Apostolic Church, the, 67.
- Church and the Age, the, 505.
- 'Chimes from Heaven's Belfry,' Jackson's, 504.
- 'Christianum Organum,' Miller's, 526.
- Cochrane's 'Resurrection of the Dead,' 259.
- Collins's 'Ancient Classics for English Readers,' 263.
- Commentary on the Gospel according to Matthew, 233.
- 'Conquest, Norman,' Freeman's, 355; Mr. Freeman's style, 357; his estimate of Harold, 359; England, why disunited, 361; growth of wealth and depression of the poorer free-men, 363; were the Britons wholly exterminated? 365; character of the Normans, 367; different political development in England and France, 369; Canute a beneficent ruler, 371; English dioceses in Edward the Confessor's time, 373; banishment of the Godwins, 375; Harold's reforms, 377; William's character and early history, 379; Edward's bequest to Harold, 381; the gathering at Dine and at St. Valery, 383; the Battle of Senlac, 385; the results of the conquest, 387.
- 'Consolation; or, Comfort for the Afflicted,' Kennaway's, 504.
- Coverdale's 'Spiritual and Most Precious Pearl,' 260.
- Councils, rules, ancient and modern, 256.
- Cunningham's 'Plays of Philip Massinger,' 516; 'Works of Christopher Marlowe,' 516.
- Cox's 'Resurrection,' 259.
- 'Course of Lectures,' Randolph's, 232.
- 'Creator and the Creation,' Young's, 513.
- 'Daniel Draper,' Rev. Symon's 'Life of,' 261.
- 'Desprez, John; or, the Apocalypse of the New Testament,' 482.
- 'Discursive Thought,' McCosh's 'Laws of,' 517.
- Drew's 'Reasons of Faith; or, the Order of the Christian Argument, developed and explained,' 502.
- Düsterdieck's 'Apologetic Essays,' 223.
- Ebrard's 'Handbook of Church History and Historical Theology,' 212.
- 'Ecclesiastical History,' Stoughton's, 243.
- 'Ecclesia,' 505.
- 'Education Bill,' Mr. Forster's, 1; sectarian unsectarianism, 3; the abstract principle of unsectarianism, 5; what we wrote three months ago, 7; statistical fallacies, 9; scope of the measure, 11; defects of the measure, 13; how the Act will take effect, 15; the conscience clause, 17; necessary amendments, 19; an operative conscience clause, 21; some evils cannot be cured by any bill, 23; what the real grievance has been, 25; alleged cases of clerical coercion, 27; local centres and school board schools, 29; must and will be no prohibition of the Bible, 31.
- Ewald's 'Introductory Hebrew Grammar,' 255.
- 'Faith,' Drew's 'Reasons of,' 502.
- Faraday, Michael, 265; his continental tour, 267; the Royal Society, 269; early progress, 271; consolidation of gases, 273; electricities, 275; electro-magnetism, 277; magnetic induction, 279; unity of forces, 281; electrolysis, 283; electro-chemical dynamics, 285; magnetism and diamagnetism, 287; magnetisation of light, 289; secular magnetic variations, 291; personal character, 293; his Christianity, 295.
- 'Flowers from Fatherland Transplanted into English Soil,' Trotter's, 519.
- Froude's 'History of England,' 241.
- Gesenius's 'Hebrew Grammar,' 255.
- 'Ginx's Baby,' 526.
- Glog's 'Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles,' 231.

- Goodwin's 'Gospel According to St. Mark,' 261.
- 'Glaphyrra, and other Poems,' Reynolds, 524.
- Griffiths's 'Institutes of the Jurisdiction, and of the Equity, Jurisprudence, and Pleadings of the High Court of Chancery,' 253.
- 'Greek Testament Grammar,' Winer's, 187; early life and writings, 189; biblical dictionary, 191; neglect of New Testament Greek, 193; his original object, 195; theology, 197; Beelen, 199; Buttmann, 201; the new edition, 203; Cremer's 'Dictionary,' 205; the editor, 207.
- Hagenbach's 'History of the Church in the 18th and 19th Centuries,' 243.
- Haig's 'Symbolism,' 261.
- Hayman's 'Odyssey of Homer,' 249.
- 'Hayti and its Struggles,' Bird's Republic of, 262.
- 'Hebrew Grammar,' Gesenius', 255.
- 'Hebrew Grammar,' Ewald's Introductory, 255.
- Historical Maps of England during the first thirteen Centuries, 520.
- 'History of the Karaites,' Rule's, 523.
- 'History of England,' Froude's, 241.
- Hölemann's 'Neue Bibelstudien,' 221.
- 'Horne Tennysonianism,' Church's, 517.
- Hunt's 'Religious Thought in England,' 244.
- Huther's 'Three Epistles of the Apostle John,' 222.
- 'Institutes,' Griffith's, of the Jurisdiction, and of the Equity, Jurisprudence, and Pleadings of the High Court of Chancery, 253.
- 'Introductory Hebrew Grammar,' Ewald's, 255.
- 'Irish Literature, Ancient,' 94.
- Jackson's 'Chimes from Heaven's Belfry,' 504.
- 'John Wesley's Place in Church History,' Urlin's, 256.
- 'Karaites,' Rule's History of, 523.
- Keil's 'Manual of Historico-Critical Introduction to the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament,' 498.
- Kennaway's 'Consolation or Comfort for the Afflicted,' 504.
- Kingsley's 'Madam How and Lady Why,' 263.
- Land Tenure, systems of in various countries, 247.
- Laureate, The, and his Arthuriad, 154.
- 'Laws of Discursive Thought,' McCosh's, 517.
- 'Life of the Rev. D. J. Draper,' Symons', 261.
- 'Life and Remains of Robert Lee,' 127; Dr. Lee's birth and education, 129; earlier opinions, 131; extracts from his early diaries, 133; *Ibid.*, 135; removal to Edinburgh, 137; the chair of biblical criticism, 139; further extracts from diaries, 141; opinions on the interpretation of Scripture, 143; sermons and reviews, 145; the ecclesiastical reformer, 147; the dispute as to ritual, 149, 151.
- 'Light of the World,' Wilkins', 254.
- 'Licensing System, The,' 389; importance of the question, 391; national expenditure, 393; evils of the traffic, 395; Committee of Convocation, 397; Associations for Reform, 399; the National Association, 401; the Liverpool Bill, 403; proposals of Convocation, 405; Sunday closing, 407; Alliance for Suppression of Traffic, 409; the Permissive Bill, 411.
- Locker's 'London Lyrics,' 524.
- 'Madam How and Lady Why,' Kingsley's, 263.
- Maps of England during the first thirteen Centuries, Pearson's Historical, 520.
- Massey's 'Tale of Eternity, and other Poems,' 524.
- 'Men of Faith,' Wiseman's, 496.
- Mercer's 'Journal of the Waterloo Campaign,' 514.
- Michaud's 'William of Champeaux and the Schools of Paris in the 12th Century,' 215.
- 'Miscellanies,' Newman's, 254.
- Morison's 'Commentary on the Gospel According to Matthew,' 233.
- Munro's 'T. Lucretii Cari De Rerum Natura,' 249.
- Newman's 'Miscellanies,' 254.
- 'Neue Bibelstudien,' Hölemann's, 221.
- 'Norman Conquest,' Freeman's, 355.
- 'Occupation and Ownership of Land in Ireland,' a Bill to amend the Law relating to, 414.
- 'Odyssey of Homer,' Hayman's, 249.
- Oosterzee's 'Theology of the New Testament,' 209.
- 'Orm,' Buchanan's 'Book of,' 524.
- 'Paraguay, the War in,' 296; geography of Paraguay, 297; former

- history, Francia, 299; Francia's death, the country thrown open, 301; dress and manners of the people, 303; visit of General Lopez to Europe, 305; portrait of Lopez, 307; causes of the war, 309; the triple alliance, 311; strength and weakness of Paraguay, 313; enormous military levies, 315; invasion of Corrientes, 317; results of the first year of the war, 319; attempt at mediation, 321; a pretended conspiracy, 323; selfish ambition of Lopez, 325; the end of the tragedy, 327.
- Patterson's 'The Poor, the State, and the Country,' 248.
- 'Paul, St., and Protestantism,' 455; St. Paul Orientalising and Judaising, 457; the Clavis Paulina, 459; St. Paul and the Old Testament, 461; righteousness, 463; faith, 465; Puritanism and John Wesley, 467; identification, 469; the example of Christ, 471; crucifixion with Christ, 473; union with Christ, 475; the Resurrection, 477.
- Payne's 'Prophecy,' 233.
- Pearson's Historical Maps of England during the first thirteen Centuries, 520.
- 'Philip Massinger,' Cunningham's Plays of, 516.
- Portraits, Webster's, 517.
- Portrey's 'Successful Student Early Crowned,' 523.
- Pressensé's 'Histoire Des Trois Premiers Siècles de l'Eglise Chrétienne,' 208.
- 'Primeval Man,' Argyle's, 237.
- 'Principles of a System of Philosophy,' Bierbower's, 488.
- 'Pulpit Analyst, The,' 263.
- Randolph's 'Course of Lectures,' 232.
- 'Raphael and his Times,' 83; Raphael's biographers, 35; Court of Urbino, 37; early life, 39; study under Perugino, 41; Florentine pictures, 43; portrait of himself, 45; summons to Rome, 47; painting of the Vatican, 49; his private life, 51; Leo X. made Pope, 53; Raphael, architect of St. Peter's, 55; the cartoons, 57; the latest pictures, 59; Raphael and Michael Angelo, 61; death and burial of Raphael, 63.
- 'Reasons of Faith,' Drew's, 502.
- 'Religious Life in Germany,' Baur's, 516.
- Reynolds's 'Glaphyra,' and other Poems, 524.
- Rigg's 'Sabbath, and the Sabbath Law before and after Christ,' 234.
- 'Rome and the Council in the 19th Century,' Bungener's, 512.
- Roskoff's 'History of the Devil,' 224.
- Rule's 'Councils, Ancient and Modern,' 256.
- Rule's 'History of the Karaite Jews,' 523.
- 'Sabbath, and the Sabbath Law before and after Christ,' Rigg's, 234.
- 'Scenes and Incidents in the Life of the Apostle Paul,' Barnes', 260.
- 'Science and the Gospel; or, the Church and the Nations,' 244.
- Schmid's 'History of Christian Doctrine,' 217.
- Schöberlein's 'Holy Trinity,' 481.
- 'Season, Browning's Words in,' 504.
- 'State, The, the Poor, and the Country,' Patterson's, 248.
- 'Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics,' Zeller's, 518.
- Stoughton's 'Ecclesiastical History,' 243.
- 'Successful Student Early Crowned,' Portrey's, 523.
- 'Spiritual and Most Precious Pearl,' Coverdale's, 260.
- 'Symbolism,' Haig's, 261.
- 'System of Philosophy,' Bierbower's Principles of, 488.
- 'Systems of Land Tenure in Various Countries,' 247.
- 'Testament,' Winer's 'Greek,' 187.
- Trotter's 'Flowers from Fatherland Transplanted into English Soil,' 519.
- 'Upright Man, the,' 523.
- Urlin's 'John Wesley's Place in Church History,' 256.
- 'Waterloo Campaign,' Mercer's 'Journal of,' 514.
- Webster's 'Portraits,' 517.
- 'Wesley, John, his Place in Church History,' Urlin's, 256.
- West's 'Whole Works of Robert Leighton,' 504.
- Wilkins' 'Light of the World,' 254.
- Winer's 'Greek Testament Grammar,' 187.
- Wiseman's 'Men of Faith,' 486.
- Young's 'The Creator and the Creation,' 513.
- Zahn's 'Marcellus von Ancyra,' 219.
- Zeller's 'Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics,' 518.

